DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 158 08 VT 011 482

AUTHOR	Smith, Robert L.; And Others
TITLE	Work Orientations of Teenagers. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Inst. for Social Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-5-0118
PUB DATE	69
CONTRACT	OEC-5-85-067
NOTE	110p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change, Educational Improvement, *Information Dissemination, *Information Utilization, Models, *Research Utilization, *Social Change, Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

It is relatively easy to gather data but to disseminate and ensure utilization of that data in a way which will induce meaningful change is not so easy. In exploring the reasons for the apparent resistance to social change, a series of three dissemination activities were organized for school personnel using materials developed on the work orientation of teenagers. These activities provided insight into the problems encountered when endeavoring to promote change. As they were identified, the problems were classified as (1) psychological resistance, (2) sociological resistance, (3) ecological resistance, (4) economic resistance, and (5) political resistance. A suggested general principle to follow in planning such activities is to identify sufficient similarities of the new context with contexts familiar to the participants. Specific suggestions were also made regarding materials content, participant's role, the format of the activity, and implementation of objectives. (JS)

BR 5-0118
PA 08
VT

ED041158

WORK ORIENTATIONS OF TEENAGERS

ROBERT L. SMITH

FRANK HAWKENSHIRE

RONALD O. LIPPITT

CONTRACT #OE 5-85-067 FOR PROJECT 5-0118

FINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VT011482

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION i

CHAPTER

I UTILIZATION PROBLEMS 1

II THE DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES 7

III SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 25

APPENDICES

A SUMMARY OF MATERIALS USED IN DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES 35

B PRESENTATION TO A HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY -- ACTIVITY I 45

C PRESENTATION TO REPRESENTATIVES FROM NINE SCHOOL SYSTEMS AT A RETREAT -- ACTIVITY II 54

D PRESENTATION TO REPRESENTATIVES FROM EIGHT SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN TWO EVENINGS -- ACTIVITY III 75

INTRODUCTION

One of the objectives of our Work Orientations of Teenagers project was to share with our field sites[1] some of our findings which seemed particularly significant for the educational setting. Sending the schools copies of final (but technical) reports or preparing special non-technical reports on selected findings are the traditional means of disseminating such information. Neither of these ways is very satisfactory. For example, one of our previous non-technical reports was distributed through the mail to cooperating principals and superintendents. A follow-up inquiry revealed that very few had read it. It appears that these influential school people receive a good deal of material through the mail which they only screen and route to other possibly interested parties, such as counselors, department heads, etc. Even when the document is read and regarded as interesting and important, the information tends to be seen as unusable.

Lecturing on some of the material is a second way of sharing research findings. The audience, we have learned, may find it interesting and sometimes entertaining but usually of limited utility. These results are not atypical of other researchers' experiences when they have actively supported efforts designed to disseminate their findings to relevant audiences.

Why does this apparent limited utility of often quite significant social research findings exist? Dissemination and utilization of research findings in such other areas as agriculture, medicine and engineering tends to be far more efficient. The ideas that can be implemented simply by means of administrative decisions tend to be broadly and efficiently disseminated and effectively utilized (though often with time lags). But many of the findings of social research, in order to be implemented, require changes far beyond that of simply adopting a new practice or a new tool. The introduction of changes in social practice often involves new skills, new attitudes, careful planning concerning supporting roles, and even changes in values. In short, the implications of such findings usually present utilization problems far beyond the immediate capability of the school system's own personnel to handle the situation without extensive help.

The main problem, then, is in the utilization process itself as well as in the dissemination networks. We, therefore, planned a variety of dissemination activities in order to help sharpen our appreciation of the critical issues involved in the utilization process. This report will include a description of our dissemination efforts in a case history form and our insights as to what we learned from the experience. The first chapter will be a discussion of the problems of inducing change in systems, the second chapter a description of the dissemination activities themselves, the third an evaluation of the experiences and directions for improvement of the effectiveness of dissemination efforts. A summary of the research findings that were actually presented to the participants is included in the appendices, along with the materials and participant evaluations of each dissemiation activity.

---

[1] Eight Detroit area public schools and three Michigan juvenile institutions.

CHAPTER I: UTILIZATION PROBLEMS

When one is looking at the whole problem of utilization of knowledge, there are many questions which are left unanswered when we try to explain how new information is obtained. It is very clear that teachers are learning their skills in colleges and professional schools and then going out to teach as they see fit. They receive some guidance and supervision on the job and they may even take courses and attend workshops to upgrade their skills. It is also very clear that the utilization of the vast quantity of knowledge which is accumulating is far slower by these traditional processes than is socially desirable or necessary. The task confronting us now is to learn how to mobilize the accumulated knowledge for utilization in its most effective and strategic way. This requires a new set of social skills which are different from various forms of research efforts and also very different from the release of public information to the media or publication in scholarly journals. What seems to be more important is finding ways for people to couple a new knowledge base to a new skills base. Mere reading about a new technology does not give the skill training and the level of familiarity for operationalizing the concepts. Working from a "cookbook" approach does not give the cognitive support necessary to accompany the new technology. Misapplication of the new technique is likely to result from either one of these approaches.

It seems to us that there is another tack which may be taken and that is for the scientist, who has a strong understanding of the data, to get involved in helping the practitioner utilize his findings. A number of things can follow from this procedure. First, and probably the most important factor, is that the data will be taken in its most relevant context. The researcher is able to set the limit on what might be called "reasonable speculations" and the implications to be drawn from his data. Someone who is not familiar with the data may be less inclined to be so cautious. Second, the teacher can ask challenging questions of the researcher which are necessary for him to explore in order to apply the concepts to his teaching. An effective dialogue between the two, we think, is the way to make sure that knowledge gets utilized, by linking both the cognitive and affective areas to the technological issues. The whole purpose of this utilization effort is to try out several different techniques of linking research to practice and then evaluate them as carefully as possible. This strategy becomes necessary because the availability of the researchers is limited.

The development of effective mechanisms to link research to practice raises a host of questions. Furthermore, the evaluation of any particular strategy is also difficult. There are many issues involved in obtaining good data to tell us what we need to know. For one thing, we are not sure as to the most appropriate techniques to use to facilitate the utilization process. Second, we are not sure what technological skills need to be marshalled by the "trainer" to help the learner acquire the attitudes and skills to implement the new approach. Third, we are not at all sure as to what the shape, form, or substance of the data ought to be in, in order for it to be understandable and utilizable by the learner. Since there are so many of these basic unknowns, we took as our central task in this project the job of experimenting with a variety of techniques which might facilitate information flow to knowledge utilizers. The techniques used will be reported here. It is important to say that what is reported here are not results of studies carried out under rigorous research conditions. For this reason they will not answer questions about the utilization process definitely. We intended rather that our techniques adopted to bring research data to the practitioner be made explicitly clear so that our methods can then be testable in rigorous studies to answer many of the unknowns that we faced. We hope that many answers will come very soon to the whole question of "How do we utilize what we already know?"

Why Do We Not Utilize What We Know?

There are many issues which come to mind as to the why's of knowledge utilization. Not the least of these are the reasons why we do not utilize what we know. Our thinking has lead us to isolate at least five critical factors which serve as effective resistances to change in old practices blocking utilization of new skills. First, are the psychological problems of using new information; second; the sociological issues of improving or changing organization behavioral patterns; third, the ecological dimensions which permit certain behaviors to occur; fourth, economic factors which impose certain costs and risks; and fifth, are the political issues, as to what gets done and who does it. More can be said about these particular issues so let us first turn to the psychological problems involved in utilization.

Psychological Resistances

One thing found from our conversations with clients as well as written feedback was a real resistance on the part of some to being involved in a learning process. Teachers saw themselves as professional people who had already obtained the skills to do an effective job. They were interested in clever and new ideas from which they might gather clues to new techniques from various sources. They were not particularly interested in seeing themselves in the dependent learner role having to grapple with facts in order to make meaning out of them. One of the real personal resistances at the psychological level then, is the whole issue of seeing oneself as somewhat incompetent or maybe incapable of carrying out a task. This immediately raises resistance against "having to go through that again" In fact, our respondent indicated this specifically with regard to various exercises by saying "this reminds me of Education 324!" There were less obvious comments such as "I haven't done this since I was in college." "My word, I haven't even thought about some of these issues since the day I was a college student." This type of evidence we labelled as resistances, at the psychological level, to being a learner.

There seemed to be an additional problem at the psychological level and that was being uncomfortable doing something new. As a professional, these people had become quite skilled at carrying out their well learned specialized role. They saw themselves as successful, and their supervisors and administrators also had this perception of them and they were consequently rewarded for their efforts. They liked this sense of comfort. It seemed to us that when we asked them to do new things there was a real resistance to being involved. We had to push quite hard to get them to even try out new activities. When they were asked to try out new activities their reaction seemed to be "Would you tell us all about what you are going to do and then we will decide if we will proceed?" They were less willing to be uncomfortable and ill at ease with the new situation and "just try it out to see."

Sociological Resistance

Let us now switch to the sociological problems. A teacher who is successful in her building maintains a degree of status because of her success. "Miss Jones can really keep her class in line" we are told. This is how she is seen in the system. Not only are her personal views of self-confidence involved, but also how the others in the system view her. If Miss Jones is asked to do something that she is totally unfamiliar with, then there is a real question of whether her place in the social hierarchy will change. She is no longer "the gal we look up to because she knows." "She is just one of the other teachers who is struggling with this problem like we are." There are real losses to one's place because of new practices coming into the school.

As a matter of fact, it is very possible that Miss Jones may not be able to adopt the practice very well at all. It may be totally alien to her style and it would mean giving up too much of herself as she perceives herself to change to the new system. If the new teaching strategy is implemented then she ends up on the bad end of the deal. If she puts forth any resistance then she is likely to be seen as old fashioned, rigid, rejecting or whatever, and her status is then reduced. The young teacher who is at the bottom of the status hierarchy, but can grasp the new situation very well because of her more recent preparation, can rise to the top of the heap. Thus, one change in curriculum plans can change the balance of power in a school. This type of change can create real dislocation and tensions and the anticipation of this happening can provide major resistance to new inputs.

Ecological Resistance

The ecological problems which are very real need to be reviewed as the whole question of time and space must be understood. Many of the new programs developing in educational practice require a helping hand of someone who can guide the learner through the critical phases. The helping person has to be available to acquaint the learner with the critical issues involved. Second, he must be able to teach the learner what he needs to know. Many of the centers of new social practice are at universities far away from the utilization site, requiring the teachers be transported to the new information or the researcher with his new information to the teacher, expending a great deal of time. Distance becomes a real barrier to people getting actively involved and at the level of intensity that is needed to develop the new practice. There is a real problem of time for all of the actors involved in learning or teaching the new skill, but there are other problems.

Space poses a different set of questions. New programs often require new demands from the physical plant than previously existing procedures. It becomes very difficult to knock out walls, and it is very expensive to replace nailed down desks with moveable student workbench seats. The space requirements of new programming is sometimes quite different, demanding a radical approach to the utilization of a physical facility. This type of major demand on the system sometimes cannot be afforded, thus, a program considered worthwhile may be rejected. There is another problem with space and that is locating the facilities within the time and with enough facilities to carry out a new project. It is sometimes very difficult to locate the appropriate facilities in the amount of time given to start new programs. For this reason school systems may turn down the opportunity to participate simply because they cannot house the new operation.

Economic Resistance

Economic matters were listed as a source of resistance. It is very clear that new social practices often are viewed as extremely expensive. An interesting example of another view of the expense of "retooling" is the automobile industry which spends a great deal of money retooling to put out a new model car. This expenditure is considered a given of the system with most people seeing the expense as a perfectly normal function of the process of building cars. This type of "retooling" expenditure is not part of our thinking, however, in social practice. We don't see the necessity for "retooling" and bringing out a "new product" as a necessarily expensive investment of progress in social interactions, therefore, there is a great deal of resistance against "all that money" being spent for a "new product." We forget that the retooling process may bring us a highly improved form of practice. Whether it is efficient or not, it certainly may be far more effective and this is the issue to be concerned with when assessing costs. We don't make this type of assessment when the initial budget calls for amounts of one hundred, two hundred or even three hundred thousand dollars. That just sounds like too much money. What we ought to compare in our minds is the cost of retooling for new social practice with the cost of retooling to build a new model of the same old car. Comparisons of this type might bring our thinking into better perspective.

One of the cost items which is confusing, hard to explain, or justify, is the need for extensive training of the practitioner to carry out the new skills. There is a tendency for us to see the practitioner as already trained and all we have to do is find the "right person" and put him on the job. We fail to look at the necessity of giving that person retraining or, a "retread" if you wish, to bring them up to par to do the job as we wish it to be done now. Furthermore, there is the necessity for personal identification of the new person, giving him time to put his roots down, so to speak, in the community where he is going to work--an added cost in time and money.

There is the necessity to bring in expert help in order to start a new practice at a high level of quality which costs a great deal of money. Part of the consultants' time must not only cover what they are actually doing on the job, but all of the preparation that was necessary to bring their appropriate data to the current situation. These time expenditures must be charged against their daily wage, making it appear very high. To some the consultation fees look absolutely exhorbitant. We often forget, however, that a high fee paid to an extremely competent consultant can do far more for us than a smaller fee paid to an incompetent one. We do not have a good way of measuring and valuing expertise so that the price tag frequently appears to be way out of line.

Another problem that frequently gets lumped under the heading of the consultant's fee is the number of visits that the resource person is suggesting as necessary for him to be involved. It seems at first glance that the number of visits are far more than they should be. We typically forget that learning a new skill takes time and a great deal of effort. What may be very easy to say, when one explains it, may be far more difficult to do when one attempts to carry it out. Many of the unexpected consequences that flow from the new behavior have to be explored and dealt with before the practice can be successfully adapted or adopted to the new situation. Time becomes an extremely important factor in designing the new social practice. Because time often comes at a high price this makes the cost factor high. Again, I suggest that we look at the whole process of retooling in industry and compare the tremendous amount of money spent there with what we are suggesting needs to be spent in social practice.

These are just some of the ideas that we have about the resistance problems found in the utilization process. From our perspective any effective efforts to deal with the utilization phenomenon must take into consideration these issues. Apparently the balance, or the mix, between the various types of resistances will be a bit different from case to case. For example, the last area which we really haven't looked at yet is that of the political one because it is a little harder to assess. We shall now speak briefly about it here.

Political Resistance

When we think of the political implications of social practice we often turn our thinking to political movements. This form of political activity is not what I have in mind at all. I am specifically concerned with the political implications of a new balance of power in a system. An example of this kind of internal shift can be seen as a result of Federal money coming directly into a school. The principal and his staff are capable of taking the initiative to apply for it. It can give a greater sense of autonomy to the principal at each individual school breaking the ties which the central office might have over him. This might suggest that the demands of that building will become more visible to the central office because they are not tied so exclusively to its control. The administrator who can write a good proposal, even if it has to be approved by the central office, is going to have more influence "downtown." Federal money coming into school systems have created problems of a political nature. Only one of these being the relationship of the individual building to the central office when it no longer becomes the sole gatekeeper of funds and resources.

It is also possible for the district as well as individual principals, and teachers to get directly involved in seeking outside funds. It seems to me that this possibility raises many questions about the political relationship of the school district to the community. The school becomes capable of funding many of its operations by direct application to the Federal or state government, bypassing the pressures and concerns of the local community. In many ways it becomes possible then for the school system to innovate in areas that the local community is not particularly concerned about nor ready to move in. Non-community funds raise serious issues as to where the balance of power should reside in a particular project and how the issues will be resolved. We have done very little thinking about this last area and a great deal more must be done.

CHAPTER II: THE DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

The problem of upgrading classroom teachers to learn new skills so that they can be more effective in helping the students to learn is an important one. The system now facilitates teacher learning by providing summer schools, extension courses, and after school classes. Theoretically, the faculty meeting is another source of learning for the teacher. Our impression is that these meetings are not used with creative skill in working out new ideas for handling the learning situations within the school. They are most often an opportunity for the teachers to complain about the students, fellow faculty, or the administration. Likewise, the administration may use them to complain about the teachers, students, central administration or to make announcements. Sometimes speakers of one kind or another may be invited. By and large, these meetings have lost their most valuable potential of providing a learning opportunity for the teachers with common problems to meet together and talk about issues significant to them. This missed opportunity is especially important to us who have done research in the schools and are asked to feed back our research findings to them. The question becomes, "How does one do this?"

There are some obvious and traditional ways of converting the results of a study back to the school. The simplest, of course, is to publish the material in a teaching journal. The researcher when finished with his studies in a particular building, would only have to refer the participating teachers to the forthcoming issue, with a polite thank you note. The second way, is to write a special report and send copies for general distribution to the school. The third is to come to the school and make a formal presentation. Our experience suggests that journals are not a very fruitful way of learning new teaching techniques. This approach does not permit the learner the opportunity of "trying out" under critical evaluation what he is learning to do and then rethinking his plan of attack. Publication of reports has a similar weakness that journal articles have in that teachers do not learn all the dimensions involved and lack the opportunity to "try out" and receive feedback on their efforts. An oral presentation to the school represents a better potential for interaction between researcher and teacher but again supervision and tryout are not usually present. Obtaining a meaningful interaction, however, is not as simple as it may sound, because of the pattern of teacher meetings which we have described previously. In short, the faculty meetings fail to appear as a source of potential for learning and active exploration of new ideas. They are not seen as a place for useful and effective criticism of what one or the other is doing. For these reasons the oral presentation of data to the schools is not considered as a significant activity likely to improve educational practice as it currently occurs.

In view of the above considerations we decided on a personal appearance at the faculty meeting as an initial activity, but designed in the following way. First of all, we knew that it had to be short--a meeting with a one-hour limitation. Second, it had to be unique in format so that previously existent high resistance to faculty meetings could be overcome in part by appearing differently to the staff. Third we wanted to give useful data to the teachers, but we knew that it is very difficult for teachers to deal with raw data per se. We recognized the need to stress the relevance factor of the data to them in our presentation. Fourth, we wanted them to have a chance to react systematically to what they were hearing rather than mumbling about it in the halls after the meeting terminated. Their reactions were to be an important part of the experience. Before it was possible for them to have organized reactions, time needed to be provided for them to think about what they had heard. This thinking to profit from the group situation needed to go on as a collective as well as an individual process. Time needed to be allowed for them to think and reflect individually on what they had heard and then meet in small groups to discuss and share with one another what they had thought about. Their sharing with their colleagues was another important objective but not the only level of sharing needed. The fifth thing was general sharing and reactions across the entire group. Not only what had happened in their own particular cluster was shared, but also ideas needed to be shared with the total faculty. Total sharing would be one way of helping the faculty see the staff meeting as a moment when they, as a total faculty, could talk to one another. This total sharing is something we think they should probably do very often. The sixth objective was for us to spend some time reacting to the group's comments as they were made so that they were not just presented and passed on to the next. We wanted to integrate their comments with the presented data, probe for ways the comments might be related to some of our hunches about the meaning of the data. In this type of dialogue we are free to bring in some of our own experiences from other school or related situations. Most of these objectives departed radically from a typical presentation of a speaker appearing at a faculty meeting.

We will next summarize the material presented in our dissemination efforts and then look at the feedback we obtained from our first activity.

The Presentation Package

We selected some summary findings for the presentation concerning the meaning of work and play for teenagers. We did not wish, however, to simply present the findings as is usually done. We presented them within a problem solving context. We presented a problem solving model as well as our findings and used the process of doing the study as one example to illustrate the steps in the problem solving model. Our strategy was to offer this and another illustration as models for working from an idea or problem through the steps of diagnosing, information collection and implementation. These two sets of inputs were about the same for all dissemination activities and so will be discussed at length here. They are illustrated in Appendix A.

The Problem Solving Model

The first step in the diagnosis of a problem is precisely framing the question, specifying the problem. In this context, we raised the study question, "What do youth think, feel and do about work and play and why?" In addition, we suggested another typical kind of question, one that might be an outcome from thinking about our findings, "How can we change what the marginal student thinks, feels and does about learning?" We emphasized the importance of obtaining information with respect to all three areas: ideas; attitudes; and behavior.

Next we reviewed information gathering within the context of sources, settings and ways. As indicated above, we used the two sample problems raised to illustrate data collection.

Finally we looked at implementation, the area in which most organizations have the least skills.

The complete outline of this part of the presentation can be found in Appendix A, page

Work and Play

We selected a summary of our findings concerning the meaning of work and play to present because it seemed to us important information for any people concerned with structuring activities for youth. We inferred from our analysis the criteria for good work and play experiences. We also found that youth vary considerably in what they experience. We found that the Negro, the below average IQ and the working class youth all had in common both negative work and play experiences within the school system, and a different set of cognitions and feelings about the nature of work and play from their white, bright middle class peers. Because of the present concern for the "disadvantaged" child, we chose the latter material to present. Summaries can be found in Appendix A, page

The Downriver High School Faculty Meeting

In review, the seven features we saw as important ingredients of our presentation and which we followed in all our dissemination activities are:

1. That it should be very short, about one hour in length.

2. That we should deal with the resistance factor by making it somewhat unique in format so that they just didn't react as they always do to faculty meetings.

3. We ought to make the relevance of what we were saying as clear as possible and stressed as frequently as we could.

4. We ought to give them time for active thinking about what had been reported.

5. We needed to be concerned with having them share their ideas with each other.

6. We should give them an opportunity to re-evaluate what they had said. (We tried to make comments and bring in our own experiences in thinking about what they had reported in their smaller groups.)

7. We gave them a definite opportunity to feed back to us their impression about what they had experienced while we were presenting our data. They were also asked about the meaningfulness of their group meetings and the value of the discussions they were having with each other.

This is basically the format of the faculty meeting presentation at Downriver High School.

In addition to what we did at the actual school presentation, there were two other steps taken that we saw as important. The first was to summarize the completed post meeting reaction (PMR) sheets collected at the end of the session. We dittoed the analysis and sent copies back to the school. This allowed the teachers as well as the administration to know what each group was thinking about our presentation. This could serve as an example of how the school could publicly share with each other some of their thinking about their common experiences. This tactic was taken in keeping with our principles of modeling examples of actual procedures which they could follow in their own practice. The second objective was to give them the opportunity to refresh their recollection from the PMR's about some of the things which had been talked about. Hopefully this added stimulus might produce some new ideas or increased commitment for action.

The final step in our approach for the initial presentations was that we sent out a followup questionnaire six weeks later. This questionnaire asked again for an evaluation of the experience which they had with us. We made a tactical error, it turned out, in the manner by which we distributed the questionnaires to the faculty. We had it distributed by the principal's office with the request that the completed forms be returned to the principal's office. Between the presentation and our followup, a good many things went on in their lives, including attempts of the faculty to negotiate with the school system for a contract. These efforts fell through and the faculty went out on strike shortly after our followup questionnaire was distributed.

Therefore, we had a very low rate of return. Out of 46 teachers only 13 returned their questionnaires (28%), and this with much follow up in terms of phone calls and requests for them to turn in the questionnaires. Those that were turned in seemed to be differing in their responses. One set seemed to be quite negative and the other seemed to be quite positive. There are some clues that might come out of the questionnaires that we should turn to at this point to try to clarify our understanding and see the meaningfulness of the one-hour presentation for the participants. There will be, however, some difficulty interpreting the followup data because of the small number of respondents as compared with 46 original PMR's completed at the end of the presentation.

Our schedule for the one-hour faculty meetings was as follows:

1. Presentation of problem diagnosis model.
2. Presentation of research findings.
3. Brainstorming in small groups concerning implications.
4. Sharing and evaluation of brainstorming uses.
5. Post meeting reaction forms filled out by participants.

We will now review selected questionnaire results. The full summaries can be found in Appendix B, page

Post Meeting Reactions (PMR)

1. Clarity of Presentation

74% Understanding process of diagnosing problems
(clear and somewhat clear)
30% Some aspects of activity unclear
(data, objectives, interpretation, etc.)

2. What was most Helpful

39%	Group discussion and feedback
22%	Presentation of findings
20%	Specific ideas generated
4%	Everything
2%	Diagnosis
4%	Nothing
9%	No report

Followup Questionnaire (N = 13 out of 46)

These responses will not be presented in the same detail because of the inadequacy of the response rate. The full summary can be found in Appendix B.

Because our interest, ultimately, is in utilization, we were disappointed in the fact that only one of thirteen indicated they had heard any ideas they would like to try out and had tried out. However, half indicated they thought the ideas they heard were important.

In general the respondents indicated a desire for more than just findings. They want techniques, ideas for programs and fully developed programs. The written in comments suggested that the time of day, setting of presentation, and length of time all contributed to making the activity less than effective.

Discussion

The difference in attitude expressed between the two sets of responses could be accounted for by a variety of reasons. Some examples are:

a. Comparisons are difficult because of unknown selectivity (and likely unrepresentativeness) of followup respondents;

b. Comparisons are difficult because of non-comparability of items used;

c. Forgetting and re-assessment of the experience may have occurred.

The audience responses were interesting and gave us some things to think about such as not sufficiently clear at beginning regarding our purposes. It is possible that they might have heard more or at least heard differently with a "utilization" set. At least one participant was somewhat frustrated by simply bringing out of ideas rather than exploring them more intensively. The timing and setting detracted from the effectiveness of the presentation.

One thing that stands out most clearly was that the presentation at the faculty meeting had no relationship to their lives according to some people. Yet, on the other hand, the meeting has a great deal of meaning and they wished that they had had more. At one point some requested to have more information as well as more help in dealing with the information. From another point of view there was a feeling that what we had done had no value and they couldn't even be involved in analyzing why it had no value. With these notions in mind lets move on to the Fairview activity where we attempted a four hour conference.

The Fairview Retreat

The notions we had in mind in deciding on what made the most effective dissemination format came from the fact that teachers attend many conferences. They are well accustomed to going to meetings and workshops, so there was a necessity to break through their negative expectation of these types of affairs in order to have an effective dissemination activity. We designed a workshop for invited people of four hours. The workshop was planned so that it did not start during the first hours of the school day giving the participants a chance to be at their schools for one or two hours in the morning and then leave for the workshop, have lunch, and return an hour before school ended. This schedule would permit them to participate in the workshop and still not have to take a whole day off from school. This type of scheduling was important if we were to get administrators to come to the meeting. The format itself had other aspects about it which were also important.

Format

In thinking about the format of the workshop itself we had to contend with some of the administrators' biases of supervisory personnel in a school system. They too, have been in the habit of going to workshops for many years and are somewhat jaded by the whole experience. It was important, therefore, that we break through their resistances by creating activities different from their expectations. The idea of combining the lunch hour with the work experience was sufficiently novel to some of them that they commented on this to us. The actual presentation was very similar to the one followed at Downriver with the difference being that we provided the participants with a packet of materials, placed in front of them, with additional information beyond what was being presented. The participants were capable of following what we were doing if they kept the materials in the sequence as packaged. The booklet contained a schedule of the planned activities followed by a detailed reporting of the data, as well as a summary statement of the data. These summary data were provided so that members could follow along while listening, as well as go back and use the detailed data reports effectively in their own subsequent discussions. The participants were seated in two groups where they reacted to the data following the subsequent presentation.

Lunch was served and the same groups were maintained at specific tables so that they could continue working on a design of a program to meet some of the issues as they saw them. The development of a specific program represented the major substantive addition to the format. The participants worked in heterogenous groups coming from different types of schools and responsibilities within the schools. Principals, counselors, other staff positions and teachers were represented. This mixed grouping created some problems even though it provided the opportunity for cross-role sharing of ideas. Several of the groups discussed things which were unique to their particular school systems but was not germain to others. Other groups were very general in their responses to the data and talked about having to change child training patterns, or getting the parents involved in education before significant changes could be made in the education of the marginal child. All of these issues were beyond the immediate scope of the school setting. The products of each group's efforts were written down and captured in permanent form. (These are summarized in Appendix C) Subsequently, the problem and their ideas for solutions were grouped together. The fourth part of the conference was the opportunity for the participants to provide a written evaluation to us as to how they saw the conference. These post meeting reaction sheets were tabulated and, as done at other workshops, sent out to the participants some time later.

At the end of a six week period a followup questionnaire was sent asking the participant to respond to how he now evaluated his experience. And again, the responses were very slow coming in and the return rate was not good (seven of the thirteen invited participants).

Included with the PMR materials sent out to the Fairview group were copies of the materials used by each group, as well as our written reactions to the proposals. For example, Group A took for itself the following question, "What special activity could a school offer to socially integrate the marginals into the total school program?" Some of the answers produced by the group were: (1) "Special activities designed for success with the marginals." and our comment was "See C.C. Jung, The Activities Club Program." as a source that they might think about as to how this type of program might be done. (2) "More liberal recognition of participants in areas of achievement." We made no comment on this point. (3) "Plant the seed of play and recognition and hope that eventually the change of attitude from marginals toward the end will change." Our comment was, "See Hawkinshire (Editor) Parents, Teachers, Youth: A Teenage Weekend Laboratory for information about attitude change. We think it requires more concentrated effort to change attitude than what is suggested here." These kinds of comments were made to help the participants gain a more critical perspective on some of the ideas which they had put forth. In addition to having the ideas from their buzz session, they had also worked on a design of a specific program according to our proposed format. Items entered on their checklist included such notions as goals, targets, methods to be used, personnel and supplies needed, and evaluation. What to do in the event of failure was also included as we were just as concerned with having them think about this problem as well as what to do when they had succeeded. Each group tried to reflect on all of these areas so that they would be more aware of the critical issues to be considered when designing a program.

Comments were directed at the various program components suggested. For example, one of the proposed action steps that came from Group A was to provide personnel well-trained in group work who can accept the marginal student. Our comment was "See C.C. Jung, The Social Adjustment Room Program for appropriate technique. It might be relevant to look at the Science Research Associates materials, also." Hopefully, we were stimulating them to think more creatively and in concrete terms about some of the problems which they actually faced. All of this material constituted their feedback from the workshop. The final phase of this part of the study was to look at the workshop again, six weeks after it had been held, and ask the participants to respond to a questionnaire. The questionnaire was very similar to the one used at the Downriver High School. This questionnaire was concerned with finding out things about the workshop itself, i.e., the techniques we were using, whether it was relevant or not, and in what ways. What problems did they experience with presentation, such as whether it was clear enough, too much, or too little. We also wanted to find out whether they were ready to take back some of our ideas to their own situations and try them out. It was important to know what ideas they might have taken back as well as determining the significance of it to their back home situation. We also wanted to find out what it was that seemed to trigger off their thinking about new ideas and whether they obtained information from professional journals, other teachers, or from building administrators. This we thought might prove to be helpful in developing more appropriate targets for future dissemination efforts. If people learn more from teacher journals than conferences, then we ought to put our efforts into writing articles for them. If they learn from fellow teachers, then we ought to work on getting teachers together and talking with one another.

Post Meeting Reactions

The original PMR items were responded to by 12 or 13; the N for the followup questionnaire was seven.

PMR

1/12	Parts of presentation unclear
13/13	Findings clear
11/12	Findings significant to educators
12/13	Somewhat to very ready to transmit information
13/13	Readiness to suggest comparable experience for own systems teachers (somewhat to very ready)
9/13	Written comments positive (four made none)

N = 7 out of 13

1. Evaluation of Presentation:

   Presentation helpful (6/7), meaningful (6/7), clear (5/6), ideas important (6/7), ideas to try out (6/7), clear how one develops a program (6/7), somewhat, to very satisfied with group's program (6/7). The single exception in all seven of the above was the one teacher responding.

2. Evaluation of Group Product:

   Own program clear (7/7), other group's program clear (5/7),

3. Utility of Group Product:

   Action: Able to utilize program (3/7), able to utilize other ideas heard (4/7).

4. Additional Help Needed:

   Need for further help, some, to a great deal: Diagnosis (6/6), designing (6/6), implementing (5/6), evaluation (6/6). One NA.

5. Types of Information which would be Helpful (many made multiple checks):

1	Facts
2	Facts and techniques
5	Techniques and ideas
5	Developed programs

6. Best Source of Help:

Number Reporting	
5	Consultants
5	Teacher's meeting

Number Reporting	
4	Seminars
2	Fellow teachers
2	Conferences for principals
1	Building administrators
1	Books
1	Conferences for superintendents
1	Post-graduate courses
0	Professional journals
0	Superintendent's office

It should be noted here that Professional journals, which received no endorsements, was the most frequently endorsed by the Downriver teachers. Note also that superintendent's office, which received no endorsements, also received none by the Downriver teachers.

7. Attitudes about Value of PMR:

2	Yes
3	No
2	No response

This might suggest that the respondents did not recall what we were referring to when we asked about the post meeting reaction sheets. In the future we should provide an extra copy so they might retain one with their workshop materials.

Other Comments

The responses to the followup questionnaire of the one teacher responding were markedly different from the rest of the respondents. It may be that the lower one's position in such a system, the more detailed the presentation of findings, implications and program designs need to be and the smaller in scope or focus.

The Frieze Campus Activity

There were a number of goals planned for the third and final activity. They can be listed as:

1. Test our model of feedback and data utilization developed in the two previous workshops over an extended period of time. Previous efforts had consisted of one and four hour presentations, whereas this session was to take eight hours. We wanted to provide an opportunity to study differences that might be obtained from a one session versus a two session experience.

2. Provide an opportunity for the group to try out relevant activities for conceptualization and planning.

3. Give the participants a chance to review their programs critically with each other, with the staff, and with young people who could help establish the relevance and face the reality of the ideas.

4. Work through the steps of program development in a systematic way.

These were some of the specific goals set for the program. In addition to these aims we wanted to locate as carefully as possible the blocks and facilitators in the utilization of information. Hopefully, this would permit us to obtain some clarity on the way participants utilized data in program building.

There were a number of different methods used to obtain our ends. The basic format followed at Fairview and Downriver was retained. That is, the presentation of data was again accomplished by the "double feeding" technique (e.g., data was fed in directly about the attitudes of teenagers towards work and play by one speaker and additional comments were made about possible ways of utilizing this information in school by a second speaker). The second activity was a chance for the group to react to the materials which they had heard. We provided a rapid group brainstorming session focused on the data. The group responses were entered on a board as a common product of the total group. We then turned our attention to our third method which was to provide time to critique what the members had written as their reactions to the material presented, as well as some of the ideas that they came up with in their groups. Hopefully, the participants would be sensitive to examining some of the ideas that they derived rather than just being accepting or passive as to what they were learning. We undertook a detailed program analysis, providing a step by step guide followed in preparing and critiquing a program for its effectiveness. From the previous group, a joint activity was built on the program analysis guide. With this information in hand, we attempted to build a model program which would meet the needs of the marginal child as we now understood him. Our sixth step was to provide a feedback and critique session of the programs which had been developed. Hopefully this critique would come from three different sources, the participants themselves, the young people who were invited as relevant critics, and the staff who were responsible for the activity. This basically was the model which we followed at the campus workshop, but there are some additional comments that should be made.

First of all, our participants came to a very strange place to participate in this last workshop. The building was the movie production studio for the University of Michigan. All the time that they were in session they were being taped on sound tape, and they worked in other studios with the strangeness of studio paraphernalia all around. With the hot lights on them, it was basically an uncomfortable and relatively difficult work environment. Despite all this, the participants seemed to become actively involved in the process, and worked very hard at trying to obtain our stated goal.

We don't know what the attitudinal set of the participants was prior to attending as they came from many different type school settings including elementary schools, high schools, juvenile institutions and a junior college. They had various responsibilities within their own schools. For example, some were superintendents of schools, others were principals, and a few were classroom teachers. Some had direct responsibility for program planning and had a great deal of experience, whereas others were newly assigned such additional responsibilities. These are some of the factors which shaped and limited our program.

In addition to the above conditions we also felt somewhat constrained in the amount of research that we could do as participant-observers. They were there to gather specific information about the marginal child's work and play attitudes, and we felt that it was not quite legitimate to do an extensive study of their attitudes and frames of reference. This would have been important to us in knowing more about how ready they were to participate in this type of activity, but of little meaning to them. We tried to be sensitive to overheard comments and questions posed for clues to answer this question. Let's look at some of these questions.

First of all, it became clear that what we "wanted from the participants" was an issue for some. That is, they felt that there were some hidden agenda items which had not been exposed and which had not been shared with them. Some seemed a little uneasy about this. We seemed to be unable to reassure them that what we wanted them to do was simply look at the data and try very hard to come up with concrete plans about how they might develop a program. There was real resistance to working with each other as a team. There were stated postures held by most on education, philosophy, its technique, and so forth, which seemed to be rather difficult to bridge or deal with. These were a few of the challenges which the group posed. We were not able to meet these challenges very well as we were not able to change the personal behavior of the participants to fit into the ongoing needs of the task. There were signs of obvious hostilities which were quickly aroused during discussions. Concern for the role of the Negro child within the school system was one such issue. When this subject was broached, there was a clear hesitancy to get actively involved as it clearly was a sensitive topic. Many of the participants were Negro. There were several of these sensitive issues in the air which made it difficult for the participants to work effectively together.

I think another difficulty can certainly be laid to the pace at which we moved. There was a great deal to be done and we moved rapidly from activity to activity. For some people this probably irritated them a great deal because it was a violation of their work style. There were, however, major differences in how people could tolerate this kind of experience.

Moving from some of these general comments we can make a specific analysis of what we saw operating during the campus workshop. It seemed very clear that the set of the participants was different. Some came to listen and enjoy the experience much as they had done at previous workshops. Others came prepared to do some active work, however, the kind of work was not clear. Whether or not it was just to think about problems or to express concern about certain issues, or to learn something that could be done about these problems was not specifically clear. But it was clear that they did not all come with expectations about active problem solving.

We mentioned briefly before that the level of experience was quite different. There were some who were very capable of conceptualizing at a high level of abstraction some of the concepts which we were talking about. To them a suitable conference would have been a rather intellectual one with a high level of verbal abstraction. Others had worked on developing programs and were somewhat familiar with our program model. For them the task of working at concrete steps was not a difficult one but a task which was very similar to their everyday occupation. Others came who were already sensitive to and critical of the status quo. Their major focus seemed to be picking at and criticizing quite sharply things that were being said. Now, these levels of experience not only made a great deal of difference in how they saw the materials presented but also what they did with them.

The participants broke down into those who were able to handle the task quite easily and those who had a great deal of difficulty in dealing with the concepts and with the procedure. For some, the procedure got in the way because they were not normally as systematic in their approach in the ways we were demanding. They tended to take one bright idea after another and deal with it the best way they could. Others wanted to be very systematic in their proceedings and found it irritating to go from one idea to the next. There was no effective common group style for accomplishing work and this seemed to be a major hinderance in developing effective concrete actions which the group could agree on. The level of familiarity with the task at hand and the work styles of members made a tremendous amount of difference in the way people performed in this particular workshop.

The energy level of the participants was also really very different. In part this was due to the general personality and life style of the individual participant. In other ways it was due to some of the many complications experienced by the participants just in getting to the workshops and home again. This was a long trip for some after they had already put in a long day at school. For the tired members it was very difficult to arouse them from their lethargy to get them involved. Contrasting the lethargic members with those who were eager and ready to move ahead and work very hard and one can see the level of conflict inherent in the situation. This work variance in energy level probably made a big difference in how the participants received the data and what potentials could be derived. Most participants commented on the pacing of the activity so that it was visible to the majority. Some saw it as exhilarating and others as debilatating.

The novelty of the method of approach itself was mentioned by many of the participants as they focused on the way the data was presented. Typically it was seen as novel and stimulating or confusing. Several indicated that they didn't have enough understanding of the concepts, as they put it, or sociological jargon in order to get involved and actively participate. The timing (or amount of time spent on each activity) was seen as novel and stimulating for some and confusing for others. Those for whom it seemed to be confusing spoke of the lack of time allowed for each activity. Those who thought of the procedures as helpful saw the movement as getting them off dead center, getting them involved, getting them away from just speech making and so forth. Once again there were major differences as to how people saw the novelty of the procedure.

The setting was mentioned by most people in informal conversations as being very distracting. The temperature of the room, the requirements of the microphone, the shifting of position and so forth, were seen as negative attributes of the experience. No one made any comment about the setting as being a positive factor in the workshop.

The task was seen as a novel and challenging one for some and terribly old hat for others. There were those who saw the task as extremely worthwhile to do, and having a great deal of novelty in format but found it extremely difficult to get involved in accomplishing what had been set out to do.

The last point of comment was the presence of the boys themselves. We invited six boys, both Negro and white, from a nearby juvenile institute. This seemed to have a great deal of attraction for most participants as they had a chance to listen to the boys and to talk with them. Some were disenchanted by what they heard and made such comments as, "these aren't marginal kids" or "these aren't the marginal kids I know." One member went so far as to question whether the information we were getting from the young people was totally honest. A perception I might agree with in that the boy did seem to get caught up in the task and tried to give information which was seen as positive and helpful. This last point is very interesting in view of the fact that all of the participants were school people who deal with children all day long. One would expect that having children around would not be novel to them, even in this unusual situation. If we might speculate, it is probably a fact that the children were involved in helping them do things in which they were somewhat expert and this might really have been the novel situation. The fact that they were able to get useful information from the child himself may have proved to be a very novel exercise for them. It is not exactly clear what they were responding to as being novel but it certainly was clear that the boys provoked a great deal of interest on the part of the participants.

As before, we ended sessions with a PMR (post meeting reaction) and six weeks later sent out a followup questionnaire. There were 20 participants at the first session and 16 who returned for the second. Ten of the 20 returned the followup questionnaire. The full summaries of their responses and comments, as well as their group products can be found in Appendix D. In addition, in Appendix D, can be found the responses of the boys to their questionnaire evaluating their experience. They were generally impressed with the idea of adults consulting with youth regarding educational planning.

Post Meeting Reactions - Session I

60%	Clear about findings presented
50%	Clear about program development check list
85%	Findings of importance to educators (yes and yes, but...)

Parts of Session Most Helpful

30%	Findings
20%	Everything
20%	Group sessions
20%	Presentation of problem diagnosis and/or program development check list
10%	Others: Final summation, brainstorming

Readiness to Take Information back to School

30%	Ready
65%	Somewhat ready
5%	A little ready

Readiness to Suggest Own Faculty Involvement in Similar Activities

40%	Ready or very ready
50%	Somewhat ready
10%	A little ready

65%	Clarity about how to develop a program
60%	Clarity about own group's program
45%	Clarity about other group's program (another 15% were "somewhat" clear)

Post Meeting Reactions - Session II

100% Satisfied (10/16) and very satisfied (6/16) with own group program

Likelihood that any of the Programs Developed Might be Utilized in own District

63%	Yes
25%	No
12%	Other (hopefully, can't say)

81% Likelihood of Utilizing any Ideas Heard (yes)

Need for Further Help (a great deal)

25%	In diagnosing
50%	In program development
56%	In implementing
25%	In evaluating

Response to Having Boys Present

56%	They had good ideas
44%	It was a good idea
31%	Helped me to "see" the marginal youth better
38%	Can see better methods of obtaining information re marginal youth

Followup Questionnaire

100%	Were findings presented of significance (yes)
70%	Did you hear good ideas from brainstorming (yes)
70%	Did you hear one you would like to try out (yes)
40%	Clarity about program development (yes)
60%	Clarity about your groups program
40%	Clarity about other group's program
90%	Satisfied (8) and very satisfied (1) with group's program
40%	Utilization of any aspect of program (yes)
60%	Plan to utilize any ideas heard

Need More Help (a great deal)

40%	In diagnosis
60%	In program development
60%	In implementation
50%	In evaluating

100%	Boys as resources (a good idea)

Readiness to Pass Information to School

30%	Ready
40%	Somewhat ready
30%	A little ready

Readiness to Suggest Similar Workshop for Faculty

30%	Ready and very ready
40%	Somewhat ready
30%	A little ready

CHAPTER III: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the dissemination activities will be discussed in four parts: content, participants, format of materials and implementing objectives. We will discuss them in that order.

Content

When one looks at content, there are two aspects to be considered. These are the optimum amount of input and the form of the findings. This, of course, omits consideration of the question of whether, indeed, the focus should be on the presentation of findings at all. We will turn to that question presently, but first let us focus on the issue of how much input is optimum.

We realized from the beginning that we must guard against overwhelming the participants with all of the findings which can be retrieved from a complex study. Degrees of significance, methodological issues, statistical manipulation, and other questions of interest to fellow researchers are not germaine to such audiences. We determined, therefore, to limit the presentation of findings to what could be covered in twenty minutes. We were able to provide a considerable amount of data in summary form without reference to percentages, numbers or statistics. In general, these findings were in such a form that they were easily interpreted as having relevance for educators. We discovered, however, and somewhat to our surprise, that the amount of findings turned out to be somewhat less of an issue to the participants than the size of the implications. Once the participants grasped the significance of the findings, there was little about the operations of schools that didn't come up for examination. However, the implications about what needed to be changed were often a level in the system beyond the direct responsibility of the participant, an insight inducing considerable frustration.

Two issues are raised. One is that the findings, or more particularly their implications, must be clearly tied to the appropriate level of responsibility for the participants in order to be maximally engaged in their consideration. If findings are widespread in their implications, participants should also come from the widest possible range. Second, given the findings, whatever the range of their implications, the participants ought to be given the ground rules that they should consider only those issues involving their own level of responsibility or role within the system. If this second procedure is followed, then there are implications for the heterogeneity or homogeneity of the grouping of the participants. We will consider this issue in greater detail shortly.

It will be recalled that we tended to devote most of our efforts at the workshops to making clear the steps important to the process of developing a program that would effectively induce desired changes. The skills required to carry out these activities of program development and implementation cannot be acquired through limited workshops such as ours. Sophisticated program planning requires skills that most school systems seem to have in very limited supply, if at all. We conclude, then that the appropriate item for dissemination is the fully developed program, not just selected social research findings. In order for the dissemination materials to be effective, they have to cover all phases of the program. Such details as implementation steps, inservice training required, costs, space, implications for other parts of the system, and administrative support, are among the problems to be anticipated. In addition, clear ways as to how participants should diagnose, evaluate, and handle problems arising from target children, and other students, parents, and the public upon the initiation of the project should also be included.

We do not mean to imply that one cannot begin with the problems within the system, consider what social research findings can contribute to an understanding of the problems, and then, by examining the implications of the findings, move on to the development of appropriate programs for solving them. Such a procedure is possible and useful, but would usually require a considerable amount of consultive assistance. Apart from the issue of whether such consultants are in sufficient supply for this course to be recommended, this is an expensive and time consuming process which may be beyond the reach of most systems. It should be noted, however, given the availability of the time and money, and resource people, the experience can be very profitable for the system both with respect to the programs developed and to the permanent program designing and implementation skills created within the system.

Our orientation in this document is to focus on the means of effective dissemination without requiring the physical presence of the expert. This, we feel, will be the more typical situation facing most school systems throughout the country.

We now see the role of research findings as one of clarifying and defining the appropriate concepts to use to attack an education issue and of illustrating the relationships and consequences to be expected from the plans drawn up to eliminate the difficulty. That is, research can serve to justify and clarify the issues and solutions. Two kinds of findings are relevant to report: basic research findings underlining the ideas and relationships, supporting the nature of the program, etc., and the findings of demonstration projects.

Sometimes potentially good innovations fail or partly fail because of unintended consequences. For example, one teacher tried to deal with some of her problems of classroom management by adopting "democratic" procedures. Her plan came to the attention of the previously uninformed school administrators when a student showed up at the counseling office having been "expelled" by the other students in the classroom; the teacher was requested to drop the plan. The failure of her plan was not due to the fact that her idea was basically unsound but that it was not adequately implemented within the classroom and that no attention was paid to the implications of the behavior of this group for the rest of the school system. In another instance, teachers were trained to develop greater sensitivity to spotting the child with emotional problems and helping him. This worked out very well, but achievement tests revealed that the rest of the class had not learned as much as usual. Again, the basic idea was good, but the consequences for the rest of the group might have been anticipated and the problem of maintaining usual levels of achievement built into the special program. Even though teachers and other school personnel can easily be brought to suggesting many good ideas for the improvement of the educational experience of their youth, they do not, at the same time, see all the implications for the retraining required, the broader system adjustments called for, the possible resistance of parents, teachers, the public, students, and often the target students as well. Many potentially sound programs have failed for these reasons. A special program which becomes labled as the "dumbbell" program will necessarily suffer from loss of sympathetic understanding of fellow students, teachers, and even parents.

The steps one goes through in moving from basic findings through derived implications to a program design are largely irrelevant to the educational practitioner. What is relevant to him is the program itself, with the findings appearing of secondary importance as supporting background material. This is not to suggest little need for facts; on the contrary, much data might be relevant to developing the background - basic and action research findings as well as anecdotal materials. In many instances, these background findings leading to the development of a particular program might be of very little interest to the practitioner who concentrates his attentions on the consequences of the program for the students (or teachers, or parents). This interest in consequences is not misplaced, because changes may affect the rest of the system in terms of optimally realizing global goals. The presentation of findings with the requirement that they be thoroughly mastered may not be relevant to the individual practitioner's needs; it may be unnecessarily confusing what appear more pressing issues. These critical details must be dealt with before the harried administration can make an effective decision about program content, almost the reverse of the researching procedures.

In summary, then, we propose that (1) the appropriate unit for dissemination should be the fully developed program, (2) that all aspects of the program should be thoroughly covered, (3) that the implementation issues raised at every step by the nature of the program should be dealt with exhaustively and (4) that findings be provided only within the context of clarification and illustration.

Participants

Our plan in the final two activities of bringing teachers, counselors, principals and superintendents together was based on the premise that their deliberations would be richer because they could bring forth varying perspectives on the same issues. We are now less persuaded that such grouping is desirable. Diversified groups bring together a wide range of skills and perspectives, thus making agreement and commitment of specific plans difficult to obtain. Part of the problem resides in the understandable fact that people from different levels within the systems cannot comfortably disregard their identities in a free exchange of ideas and feelings. We have two proposals concerning the immediate target of disseminating materials: (1) that separate sets (or sections) of materials, which are appropriately pitched to the different levels of responsibility within the system, be developed for each program, and (2) should it be relevant to have representatives of other roles participate with the primary target group (as consultants, for instance), that separate training materials (or sections) be included which will help the group handle the consultive role in a facilitative manner.

A Sample Program Package

We might make use of an example to illustrate the ideas introduced above. Let us consider a program which would meet some of the problems of the marginal youth implied by our findings. He is alienated from the system as a result of a long history of negative feedback. He perceives work for the most part, in terms of being instrumental to things not directly implicit in the task. We might specify two objectives for the older youth which would help him to function better in the system.

1. He should be rewarded both tangibly and intangibly for his work and thereby be able to begin feeling less alienated.
2. He should be provided experiences so that the possibility of work being intrinsically rewarding to him can develop.

An objective for the younger students would be that they should receive more attention and more positive reinforcements for what they do. One program could be directed toward all three of these objectives by hiring the marginal high school youth to serve as teaching assistants in the elementary grades. Such a program should be instituted in those elementary schools with many potential marginal youths. Among the consequences one might expect from such a program would be:

1. an increase in the feelings of self-worth and confidence among such youths;
2. better relations with peers, teachers, and indeed, their own families;

3. increased interest in learning; and
4. improved school performance.

The elementary students could obtain more immediate personal attention and immediate feedback and help with their learning. There would be the added benefit of having available role models less psychologically and chronologically distant than the often overloaded middle-class teacher.

What does the teacher need to know to participate in such a program? A most important question! Such a plan would mean that she certainly could not or should not conduct her classes as usual. The dissemination materials would have to sensitize her to some of the problems of optimally utilizing such resources in her classes. Clear expectations should be provided as well as limitations as to possible outcomes. The type of help these youths would need and how to help them acquire such aid would be clarified for her. Other problems, beyond the teacher's role, should be included in supplemental materials. Training materials would be required to help the teachers meet with the older youth regularly in small seminars to learn about their role with the younger children and their relationship with the classroom teacher. Training units would be needed for use in this seminar with the youth. The materials should cover the content and skills important for being an effective teaching assistant as well as including methods and techniques for teaching these skills. It would probably be important for a senior person to serve in a consultive role in part of the original teacher training sessions needed to get the program under way. The teachers themselves would require continuing opportunities to meet with this staff person to bring up problems and explore solutions, especially during the early phase. The leader of such meetings should be the same person who is handling the seminar meetings of the youth in order to reduce the problems of coordination. The person in this coordinating role would require materials to help acquaint him with his role, to sensitize him to the problems to be anticipated, and to suggest solutions and techniques for discovering additional solutions. Other materials might be appropriate for the administrative personnel to help in recruitment, explaining the program to parents, the school board, etc.

In short, we are proposing that program dissemination materials be designed to be directly aimed at those in the system who will be most involved in the program, who will require the acquisition of new skills and perspectives, and that different materials be prepared for the different roles and responsibilities with the program.

Format of Materials

We learned several things during our dissemination activities which have implications for the format of the materials. These will be discussed under the headings setting, pacing, and process checking, in that order.

Setting

Only the second of our three activities was scheduled at an optimum time of the day and in an optimum setting. This activity, the four-hour workshop at Fairview, was scheduled as a retreat, and it ran from ten in the morning until two in the afternoon with lunch included. The participants had time to go to their offices; come to the meeting and then drop back by their buildings on the way home. Attending the meeting during working hours placed no undue strain on them; the experience was rated as pleasant and "recreation" by them because it was a break in their routine. Even if the activity had been of poor quality, it might not have been experienced as such. In marked contrast, the first workshop was held as a faculty meeting at the end of day, during the monthly faculty meeting (which was universally unpopular). The participants were generally eager to get the business over with and be on their ways (although many did get involved in our activity despite these feelings). The final, eight-hour activity was scheduled for two evenings, a Tuesday and a Thursday, running from six until ten o'clock at night. These participants had already put in a full day, and many had to drive some distance to attend. Our conclusion is that dissemination meetings for school personnel should be scheduled during the work day if at all possible or on Saturday should it prove not to be a hardship. The more the meeting area differs from the usual school environment, the better one is able to create a more relaxed atmosphere. The attitudes, perceptions and motivations of people are very much tied to the settings they are in. It can be helpful in order for learning, and more especially for relearning, to take place that the participants be in or have the feeling of being in a different setting. One of the problems of inducing change is to "unfreeze" the target of change; the more similar the environment in which the change-inducing efforts are made is to the usual working environment, the more frozen the participants may remain.

In short, we are suggesting that the setting of the training or retraining experience can facilitate or hinder the learning, that it is important to get people out of their usual routine; otherwise only "standard" messages will tend to be received.

Pacing and Set

It is important that the participants be clear about each point at all times. We observed that some participants asked for clarification about our objectives midway through or at the end of the activities. Clearly, although we had tried to emphasize the point that our objective was utilization, they had not heard the message. It would seem that many were not listening with their "utilization" ear.

The point is that no message can be assumed to have been received and understood. When it is important that the participants have a particular set when hearing a message, a check should be built into the activity to determine whether he does, indeed, have that set. The participant should be clear about the overall session objectives, the justification for them, and the place of each intermediate step in the process of attaining these objectives. Every transition point, requiring a change of set, should be emphasized and doublechecked. Once the activity gets ahead of the participant, his learning becomes ineffective. Checks must be built into the ongoing process to insure that his attention is appropriately fixed at all times. Checklists giving guides to the details of the activity would be one aid. Each participant would be asked to check off each step as it is accomplished on his own personal list, much as one checks off his completed steps in putting together something like a do-it-yourself hi-fi set. This technique by itself, however, would be insufficient. There needs to be a check on the participants' understanding (or accomplishments) that gets communicated to those leading the group. Group leaders should also have a feeling for whether those involved are clear about what is to come.

The second, but related, issue concerns the pacing of information. There are two aspects to be considered; the total number of separate sets of ideas, and the rate at which they are presented. Our findings were presented within the context of how to diagnose a problem within the school system. We suspect the participants were not always sure whether to attend primarily to the research content being presented or to the structural process of the problem diagnosis. We noted that as they became involved in the findings and their interpretation, they would forget questions they had about the diagnostic process and vice versa. We now feel that the two sets of ideas should have been presented separately so that each would have been clearer and so that better feedback to the leader about what was incompletely understood could have been obtained.

The rate of the input of information should be paced so that each significant point in the process is seen and experienced as a unit. In addition, there should be built in feedback checks to ensure that it has been "fixed" in its desired form. One technique would be to have participants paired off and asked to compare their responses to prepared stimulus questions. Their answers would reveal to themselves and their leaders whether they were on the right track.

We are proposing then, that the effectiveness of inputs, whether designed to create a set or to communicate a point, be ascertained by built in checks rather than by one's assuming that they have been received

Process Checking

Almost any kind of major program innovation will require such changes in attitudes and behavior that it will involve the participants in painful experiences. The format of procedures can be designed to minimize them but they will still occur. It is highly unlikely that experienced people can be trained without their encountering often considerable tension. The usual way of responding to evidences of discomfort is to try and reassure the sufferer. However, the consequences of this is usually to increase the feelings or to give rise to added ones. Telling an anxious person not to be anxious usually only increases the tension surrounding the anxiety issue. Too probing an inquiry into feelings of discomfort can set off complicating feelings about being manipulated and similar mechanisms. Once a group starts down this road, it is very difficult to get back to the task at hand in a productive manner.

This does not mean, however, that no process checking should be done; some must be, but it does suggest that it must be handled very delicately. Techniques for handling such process issues must be part of the training materials available to those with the responsibility for handling the inservice training for the new program. We feel that an effective strategy is that all inquiry questions should be directly task related. Example: "How do you feel" questions must be avoided. Instead, one can be attentive to verbal or non-verbal cues suggesting restlessness, inattentiveness, fatigue, etc. It can then be pointed out that these behaviors have been observed, and a question can be raised concerning whether it is the hour, whether the inputs are proceeding too rapidly, whether something has been skipped, or whether something has not been made clear. Once the issue has been raised in such a context, then the participants might be asked how they see the current situation.

It is best to keep all discussion at the content and events level because general process inquiry will tend to generate considerable anxiety which not only is very difficult to deal with constructively, but which will also take the group into areas having nothing to do with the content problems. The overall orientation of the package of dissemination materials should be an invitation to do task-oriented work, not process work. Therefore, all techniques built in for the leader of the training sessions should focus on task, not process issues. Process cues should be provided so that the leader can spot them in apparent instances of inhibition of the group in doing work.

Our final proposal of this section, then, is that we should anticipate problems arising which would hinder the learning process. Training materials for the trainer should include information of clues to be observed indicating inhibitions of various sorts. Task-oriented ways of responding to these issues should be provided for his use.

Implementing Objectives

The ultimate goal of any dissemination activity should be the improvement of the educational experience of the student. Such an objective is not an incidental goal, but is imperative in order to meet the basic function of a school. Changes occuring in the educational setting may be in the curriculum, behavior of the teachers, administrative policies, etc. The means of such changes can be the utilization of currently available but little used information known to social science. Utilization of this information can occur by means of the appropriate skill training and concept training of relevant people. Such training can be provided through introduction of carefully prepared materials which would have wide utility and would not require the presence of (non-available) experts.

In general, the following three categories of materials would be required.

1. Skill training for those who will be most directly involved in the change effort, i.e., those who will be required to behave differently, express different attitudes, "see" different things, etc.
2. Materials to brief those in the system who will be responsible for training those carrying out the new program, whether they be students, teachers, counselors, parents, or whatever.
3. Implementation materials for those administratively responsible for phasing in the program; materials covering such aspects as space utilization, equipment needs, budgetary planning and funding procedures, as well as recruiting techniques to locate appropriate participants and staff, public relations approach, diagnostic skills and intervention techniques for anticipating and handling resistances at all levels within and outside of the system. There are hundreds of places one can go wrong in the implementation of a new program (see Chapter I); therefore, these materials should prepare the system personnel to anticipate and handle them.

The skill training material for those carrying out the program represents the greatest challenge. One important principle to be followed in their construction is the identification of currently existing relevant skills by those already functioning in the settings or from other related contexts. In this way the package materials could focus on mobilizing them and demonstrating their adaptability to the context of the new program. The tactic of the skill exercises would be to make sufficiently clear the structural similarity of their current situations so that the transfer generalization process could take place with minimal resistance.

People generally have more "skills" than they are aware of applying to a specific situation. One frequently has the "aha" kind of experience on perceiving the applicability of a skill in a new context or in achieving integration of skills into a currently existing situation. One reason we do not have such experiences more often is that we are not very systematic in seeking out practices for adoption or adaptation of skills that we already have at our command. From our earliest years, we are taught to look at each situation as unique to the particular actions involved, so we fail to become sensitized to the overriding similarities frequently involved. To be really self-conscious about the similarity of systems requires a set of concepts at a systematic level which includes perspectives on personal and interpersonal relationships. For example, it has been found that people can handle new roles with a minimum of training for that specific role because, when placed in the new situation, it appears that they begin responding to a field of forces they are already experienced at perceiving, although not self-consciously so. To the extent that the field represents a unique set of forces for them, it is possible for some to display "new" behavior. For others, this kind of role flexibility is not possible, and they act inappropriately in the new situation. For some it is not so much a matter of learning roles as it is a question of moving into different positions which call to the fore their acquired skills of responding to the field of forces and adapting their behavior appropriately enough to the situation. The learning (and need for skill training) which take place depends on whether we are responding adequately to all the forces and responding appropriately to relatively new cues. With feedback, we often end up being better oriented to the appropriate forces within the field. What is learned, strictly speaking, is the location of forces within the field and not necessarily new behavior. The behavior, in this sense, was frequently learned a long time before, we just now respond to the situation as it appears to be defined.

In summary, then, we have suggested a general principle to guide the training design for the skill training materials. The trainee will usually possess the rudiments of the required skills and his potential learning demands that the central focus of the exercises be to identify sufficient similarities of the new context with contexts familiar to him. This will optimize his rapid adaption and adoption of the behavior to the appropriate situation.

APPENDIX A

Summary of Materials used in Dissemination Activities

Findings. Attitudes of In and Marginal youth toward work and play.

Problem Diagnosis Model

Program Analysis Guide

Bibliography of Reference Material

Summary of Findings

Who are the INS and who are the MARGINALS?

Attribute	"INS"	"MARGINALS"
Social Class	Middle class - white collar occupation	Working class - blue collar occupation
Race	White	Negro
IQ	Above Average	Below Average
Relative Achievement	Over achiever, relative to actual ability	Under achiever, relative to actual ability

The findings concerning attitudes toward work and play can be summarized in terms of the "INS" versus the "MARGINALS" inasmuch as the differences for each of the four variables, Class, Race, IQ, and Relative Achievement were comparable and clear cut.

This chart may help you to spot quickly the potential "INS" and "MARGINALS" in your school.

Attitudes of Teenagers Towards Work and Play

Summary of Findings

What Teenagers say about WORK

Question	"INS"	"MARGINALS"
1. What is Work?	a. Work requires mental or physical effort.	a. Work is what you do to earn a living.
	b. Work is something that requires patience and concentration.	b. Work is something you do for money.
	c. Work is something that is often boring, that is a "drag".	c. Work is how you get fame and wealth.
2. When do you like Work?	a. I like work when something is accomplished.	a. I like work when I receive pay or recognition.
	b. I like work when it is stimulating.	b. I like work when there are nice people to work with, when working together with others.
	c. I like work when you do something helpful.	c. I like work when the surroundings are pleasant, when the working conditions are good.
3. When do you not like Work?	a. I don't like work when nothing is accomplished, when it is a waste of time.	a. I don't like work when there is no pay or recognition.
	b. I don't like work when it interferes with more important work.	b. I don't like work when I have to work alone or when I don't like the people.
	c. I don't like work when it is boring or routine.	c. I don't like work when the working conditions are not good.

These are typical answers of 1,200 teenagers who were interviewed in the study.

Attitudes of Teenagers Toward Work and Play

Summary of Findings

What Teenagers say about PLAY

Question	"INS"	"MARGINALS"
1. What is Play?	a. Play is what you do to get rid of the tensions of work.	a. Play is a social activity, it involves other people.
	b. Play is something that requires little effort.	b. Play is good for your health, it builds you up.
	c. Play is something you don't have to be told to do, that you like to do.	c. Play is where you develop confidence.
2. When do you like Play?	a. I like play when it refreshes, when you can forget your troubles.	a. I like play when the people are nice, when you have a sense of belonging.
	b. I like play when it is something you really want to do.	b. I like play when I'm relaxed, when I feel like playing.
	c. I like play when I win.	c. I like play when I gain something like confidence or learning something.
3. When do you not like Play?	a. I don't like play when I lose or when people laugh at me.	a. I don't like play when I don't like the people.
	b. I don't like play when it is a waste of time.	b. I don't like play when I'm not in the mood for it.
	c. I don't like play when I'm forced into it.	c. I don't like play when the people are bad sports, wher things get out of hand.

These are sample answers from 1,200 teenagers as to their attitudes about PLAY.

Attitudes of Teenagers Toward Work and Play

Summary of Findings

How we interpret the attitudes of INS and MARGINALS.

	"INS"	"MARGINALS"
W O R K	Work has meaning for itself alone - the activity can be directly rewarding.	Work is what you do to get something else - e.g. pay and social satisfactions.
P L A Y	Play has a relationship to work - it's how tensions resulting from work get released.	Play is social in nature - it is through play that one gets close to others.

In general we can say that the views of the "INS" reflect their greater integration into, and identification with, the system. Work is directly meaningful and rewarding to them but at a cost in effort. The accumulated tensions of work seem to be released in play. Play experiences which result in increased rather than decreased tensions are not liked.

When we look at the "MARGINALS" we see that their views reflect their relative segregation from the system. They don't identify with the system because of a long history of unrewarding experiences. They seek their sense of belonging with others in non-work experiences. They find meaning and rewards in people rather than in work. Work, for them, has value depending on the pay or social satisfactions involved.

Steps in the Diagnosis of Problems

I. Specifying the Problem (Framing the Question)

Sample Question: What do children think, feel, and do about work and play? and why?

Sample Question: How do we improve what the marginal student thinks, feels, and does about learning?

Important Note: Data collection should tap all three areas, thinking, feeling, and behavior.

II. How to Organize Ourselves to Collect and Use Information (Organization of resources)

Instruments (for information gathering)

1. Interviews
2. Questionnaires
3. Observations
4. Etc.

Sources (Persons from whom we gather information)

1. Students
2. Parents
3. Teachers
4. Consultants
5. Successful programs
6. Etc.

Settings (The place where we gather our information)

1. Classroom
2. Playground
3. Home
4. Etc.

III. How Do We Implement the Ideas Thought Of? (Implementation of goals)

1. Examine the Implications for:

The Individual
The Group
The School System
Important Note: All three must be considered carefully.

2. Planning for:

Change
Needed Training for Change
Introduction of Change
Important Note: Successful changes cannot be made unless we have taken all three steps.

3. Assessment of Effectiveness of Changes

Important Note: Because we like the program doesn't mean that we have reached our specific goals.

A Guide to Help you Make an Effective Analysis of Your Program

1. Program Content
    - a. Goals of the program
    - b. Target of the program
    - c. Methods to reach goals
2. Personnel and Supplies
    - a. Personnel directly (classroom teachers) and indirectly (parents) involved.
    - b. Equipment that must be purchased, borrowed, or adapted.
    - c. Budget both an optimal and minimal amount specified.
3. Evaluation of Program
    - a. Sources of Resistances--teachers
        - administrators
        - policy makers in the system
        - public
        - students
    - b. Failures--
        - not meeting some or all of the goals
        - dissatisfactions with the goals selected
        - excessive disruption of current operations
        - gross misunderstanding of program
        - other
    - c. Successes--
        - goal attainment
        - public acceptance
        - staff acceptance
        - student acceptance

Bibliography of Research
Socialization and Education Program
Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge

Butman, Jean W. and Jane A. Kamm, The Social, Psychological, and Behavioral World of the Teen-Age Girl: A Final Report. The University of Michigan, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, June 1965, Mimeograph, 215 pp.

Caplan, Nathan S., Gerald D. Suttles, Dennis J. Deshaies, and Hans W. Mattick, Factors Affecting the Process and Outcome of Street Club Work, Sociology and Social Research, Jan. 1964, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 207-219.

Chesler, Mark, Richard Schmuck and Ronald Lippitt, The Principal's Role in Facilitating Innovation, Theory into Practice, Dec. 1963, Vol. 2, No. 5, pp. 269-277.

Epperson, David, The Dynamics of Two Variants of Classroom Alienation, Abstract of doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1962, 7pp.

Epperson, David, Margaret B. Luszki and Richard Schmuck, Interpersonal Relations and Mental Health in the Classroom, Mental Hygiene, April 1963, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 289-299.

Fox, Robert and Ronald Lippitt, The Innovation of Classroom Mental Health Practices, Innovation in Education, Edited by Matthew B. Miles, Columbia University Teachers College, New York, 1964, pp. 271-297.

Fox, Robert S., Ronald O. Lippitt and Richard A. Schmuck, Pupil-Teacher Adjustment and Mutual Adaptation in Creating Classroom Learning Environments, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1964, 156 pp. (Inter-Center Program of Studies on Children, Youth, and Family Life document series, #16).

Fox, Robert S., Ronald O. Lippitt and John E. Lohman, with Marie [illegible], Teaching of Social Science Material in the Elementary School, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1964, 200pp.

Gold, Martin C. and Jerry A. Winter, A Selective Review of Community-Based Programs for Preventing Delinquency, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1961, 106 pp. (Inter-Center Program of Studies on Children, Youth, and Family Life document series, #3).

Gold, Martin C., Status Forces in Delinquent Boys, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1963, 229 pp.

Gould, Raymond F. and Ronald O. Lippitt, Delinquency Patterns, Causes, Cures, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1961, 53 pp. (Inter-Center Program of Studies on Children, Youth, and Family Life document series, #3).

Hawkinshire, Frank B. W. (editor), Parents, Teachers, Youth: A Teenage Weekend Laboratory, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1962, 62pp.

Hoffman, Lois W., Effects of Maternal Employment on the Child, Child Development, 1961, Vol. 32, pp. 187-197.

Kaufman, Mable, Richard A. Schmuck and Ronald O. Lippitt, Creative Practices Developed by Teachers for Improving Classroom Atmospheres Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1963, (Inter-Center Program of Studies on Children, Youth, and Family Life document series, #4).

Lippitt, Peggy and John E. Lohman, Cross-Age Relationships - An Educational Resource, Children, 1965, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 113-117.

Lippitt, Ronald O., Peggy Lippitt and Robert Fox. Children Look at their Own Behavior, National Educational Association Journal, Sept. 1964, Vol. 53, No. 6, pp. 14-16.

Lippitt, Ronald O., The Child's Relation to the Educational Community, Mimeograph, 22 pp.

Lippitt, Ronald O., The Effects of Authoritarian and External Controls on the Development of Mental Health, Recent Research on Creative Approaches to Environmental Stress, Edited by Ralph H. Ojemann, University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, 1964.

Lippitt, Ronald O., and Mary Powell Flanders, Sharing Good Teaching Practices, National Education Association Journal, Dec. 1965, Vol. 53, No. 9, pp. 20-22.

Lippitt, Ronald O., Training for Participation, Adult Leadership, June 1965, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 72-74.

Lippitt, Ronald O., The Use of Social Research to Improve Social Practice, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, July 1965, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 663-669.

Mattick, Hans W. and Nathan S. Caplan, The Chicago Youth Development Project, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1964, 123 pp. illus.

Morris, Ruth R., Attitudes Toward Delinquency by Delinquents, Non-Delinquents and Their Friends, British Journal of Criminology, July 1965, pp. 261-265.

Schmuck, Richard A., *Educating for Primary Relations*, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1962, 27pp.

Schmuck, Richard A., Margaret Luszki and David C. Epperson, Interpersonal Relations and Mental Health in the Classroom, *Mental Hygiene*, April 1963, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 289-299.

Schmuck, Richard A. and Anita Lohman, *Peer Relations and Personality Development*, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1965, 55 pp.

Schmuck, Richard A., Sociometric Status and Utilization of Academic Ability, *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, July 1962, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 165-172.

Schmuck, Richard A., Some Aspects of Classroom Social Climate, *Psychology in the Schools*, Jan. 1966, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 59-65.

Schmuck, Richard A., Some Relationships of Peer Liking Patterns in the Classroom to Pupil Attitudes and Achievement, *School Review*, University of Chicago, Autumn 1963, Vol. 71, No. 3, pp. 337-359.

Smith, Robert L., *Attitudes of Teenagers Toward Work and Play*, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, 1965, 68pp.

APPENDIX B

Activity I
Presentation to a High School Faculty
(The Two-Hour Activity)

Schedule of Activity I

Summary of results from brainstorming concerning implications of findings with staff comments

Summary of Post-Meeting Reactions (PMR's) of 46 participants

Summary of Followup reactions of 13 of the 46 participants

Schedule of Activity I

1. Presentation of Problem Diagnosis Model
2. Presentation of findings on the attitudes of In and Marginal youth toward work and play.
3. Brainstorming in small groups concerning implications of the findings for the educational setting.
4. Sharing and evaluation of brainstorming ideas.
5. Post-Meeting Reactions of participants.

Activity I - Brainstorming

Summary of Ideas Concerning the Problem of Marginals in the School System

1. Some things the Teacher could or should do

   a) More recognition of Marginals in class work.

   b) Teacher should seek out some ways to recognize the student for what he has accomplished.

   c) Change ideas and projects required of students to meet the needs of both groups (Ins and Marginals).

   d) Activities must be planned which will "reward" Marginals as well as Ins.

   e) Know the students so you can meet his needs.

   Our Reactions to the above ideas

   The next step in considering such ideas as these is to develop and implement specific approaches to the problem. Two documents which may be of assistance to some of you in developing specific approaches are Inventory of Teaching Innovations Directed toward Improving Classroom Learning Atmosphere edited by Fox and Schmuck, Document #7 in the Document Series of the Program on Children, Youth, and Family Life. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Instutute for Social Research, 1961; and Inventory of Classroom Study Tools for Understanding and Improving Classroom Learning Processes edited by Lippitt and Van Egmond, Document #8 in the Document Series of the Program on Children, Youth, and Family Life. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1962. Another possible source, more specifically dealing with work and play, is another Institute publication, Attitudes of Teenagers Toward Work and Play, by R. L. Smith, Field Report #1 on the Work Orientations of Teenagers Project, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1965. A copy of these documents has been provided to the school; The Prediction of Academic Performance - A Theoretical Analysis and Review of Research by David E. Lavin, N. Y. Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

2. Some things the Teacher should have provided for them

   a) The teaching system must evaluate itself in order to determine whether the teachers' attitudes are those of Marginal or In group (See note of [illegible] below).

   b) Teachers should have specific training so they can become more aware of the reactions of Marginals and Ins to the learning situation.

c) Teachers must be free and unrestricted in being able to learn themselves. The training programs should occur when teachers are relaxed and not over-burdened or tired from the days work.

> There are teacher attitude survey instruments available which are described in the *Mental Measurements Yearbook*, edited by Buros, O.K., the Gryphon Press, Highland Post, New Jersey, 1959.

3. Some Information or Resources to be Obtained by the Teachers

a) It is important that the teacher know both the social implications of Marginals and Ins on the system and be aware of the implications of the way the system functions on the achievement behavior of the child.

b) There should be available many resources for learning about each child.

c) There needs to be sufficient information obtained to decide whether the problem is to change the values of the students or change the programs of the system (or perhaps some combination of these two).

4. Some Suggested Programs

a) Smaller classes will promote a better chance for recognition of achievement and for teachers to know students.

b) There should be organizational changes to permit the *allowance* and *encouragement* of individual differences that is productive of effective teaching.

c) There should be ungraded primary and secondary schools.

d) There should be no passing and failing, with only achievement being graded.

e) Where possible, programmed sets should be used.

f) Trouble-shooting class where students with "problems" meet in small individualized classes upon completion of which they are returned to regular classes.

g) Refer (student) to small unstructured interaction groups.

> A program similar to the one suggested (4 f and g) is reported on in *The Social Adjustment Room Program* by C. C. Jung, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1964. (A copy of this document has also been provided the school.)

Post-Meeting Reaction Summary from 46 Participants of Activity I

1. Was this presentation helpful to your understanding of the process of diagnosing problems?

YES	61%
Somewhat, to a degree	13
Not especially new, was familiar	11
NO	11
Not especially helpful, but thought provoking	4
Total	100%

2. Were there any parts of the presentation which were unclear to you? Would you tell us why?

Presentation was clear		61%
Parts were unclear - Breakdown		30
Data presentation (unclear about the division between "Marginals" and "Ins", presentation of Play findings was confusing, were the attitudes of the Marginals bad?)	(7%)	
The goal of the small group discussion was unclear.	(6%)	
Other parts of the presentation (unclear about objectives of speakers, not enough depth, too much material for end of work day).	(9%)	
Lack of clarity (but of what was not stated)	(4%)	
Questions (what can teachers do to help? How does success in gym affect history class?)	(4%)	
Attitude not reported		9
Total		100%

3. What part or parts were most helpful to you?

Group Discussion and Feedback 39%

Parts of the discussion, seeing differences in teacher's attitudes and understandings, realizing scope of situation, the ideas, the problems and possible solutions, made one reconsider own job and possible improvement, stimulated.

Presentation of Findings 22%

Calling attention to students' different attitudes toward work and play, relationships of work and play, the differences between "Ins" and "Marginals," summary of findings, the facts presented, the analysis of the data, the contrast between "Ins" and "Marginals."

Specific Ideas 20%

The realization that certain events or classes affect student's entire day, carryover to other classes of experiences, seeing need to recognize different attitudes of various groups, seeing need to try to meet their needs, recognition that school must cope with these problems, emphasis on individual rather than group differences, recognising need for understanding family to understand child's growth, recognition of need for observation of student to understand behavior.

Everything 4%

All parts were beneficial, reinforced own attitudes.

Process of Diagnosis 2%

Nothing was Helpful 4%

Attitude not Reported 9%

Total 100%

Followup Reactions to Activity I
of 13 of 46 Participants

1. As you recall the faculty meeting presentation, did it:

   5 Help you
   4 Frustrate you
   3 Make no impression
   1 Don't remember

2. Did you find the presentation meaningful or irrelevant to working out plans for dealing with the type of problems discussed?

   4 Meaningful
   3 Someplace in between
   6 Irrelevant

   2a. If irrelevant, could you tell us why in terms of the following:

   Was there not enough time to make it meaningful?

   2 Yes
   4 No

   Was the material presented insufficient?

   5 Yes
   2 No

   Was it unclear that you might make use of the material presented?

   8 Yes
   0 No

3. As you recall the presentation of information, how would you rate it?

   4 Clear
   6 Not clear
   1 Don't remember
   2 Other

4. Thinking back to the faculty meeting presentation, were there ideas mentioned which struck you as being important?

6	No
6	Yes
1	Not reported

4a. If so, could you list them here?
Ideas about play. At the time, impressed me but too many things have intervened. The fact that the student's experience in one class can affect him in next class. That certain events and classes can affect a student's entire day. Problems of the Ins and Outs.

5. Were there any ideas which impressed you as something you would like to try out?

1	Yes
11	No
1	Not reported

6. Did any of the ideas you heard at the faculty meeting lead you to make any new plans to meet the school difficulties of the Marginal child?

1	Yes
11	No
1	Not reported

7. What types of information would be most helpful to you in preparing you to cope with the Marginal child?

2	Raw facts only
4	Raw facts and specific techniques
4	Specific techniques and ideas for programs
3	A developed program (facts, their interpretation, techniques, and a fully developed plan)

8. What would be the best source of such information for you?

5	Teachers meetings (professional conferences)
5	Professional journals
4	Fellow teachers
4	Consultants to building or fellow teachers
4	Books
2	Seminars
1	Post-graduate courses
0	Building administration
0	Superintendent's office
0	Conferences for principals
0	Conferences for superintendents.

9. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Teachers are very pressed for time. The everyday demands of teaching takes so much of a teacher's time and energy that seemingly little of either is left to allow the teacher to get to know his student's better, become aware of their problems and be of assistance; this is most regrettable.

Your presentation suffered from lack of knowledge on the part of the audience on just what you were trying to do. It seemed like much to do about nothing. The discussion was poorly presented. The introduction to the subject was nil, so I didn't get much out of the presentation.

A program such as this should be presented when ample time is available to do justice to it, not after a full day of teaching. I believe presentations of this type should be made earlier in the day -- at least not so close to the end of our school day when our minds are too tired to concentrate.

APPENDIX C

Activity II
Presentation to Representatives from Nine School Systems at a Retreat (The Four-Hour Activity)

Schedule of Activity II

Summary of results from brainstorming concerning implications of findings with staff comments

Summary of program ideas developed

Summary of Post-Meeting Reactions of the 13 participants

Summary of followup reactions of 7 of the 13 participants

Schedule of Activity II

1. Reception period
2. Presentation of Problem Diagnosis Model
3. Presentation of findings on the attitudes of In and Marginal youth toward work and play
4. Reflection concerning implications
5. Brainstorming in small groups concerning implications of the findings for the educational setting
6. Sharing and evaluation of brainstorming ideas
7. Break for lunch
8. Work on program development (in small work groups)
9. Presentation of programs developed to other groups for critique
10. Post-Meeting Reactions of participants

Activity II Brainstorming

Ideas to Meet Challenges Presented by Marginal Child

Group A

This group posed for itself the following question: "What special activities could a school offer to socially integrate the marginals into the total school program?"

Some of the group members' answers were:

1. Special activities designed for success of the marginals.

   (Comment: See C. C. Jung, The Activities Club Program.)

2. More liberal recognition of participants in areas of achievement.

3. Plant the seed of pay and recognition and hope that eventually the change of attitude from "Marginals" toward the "Ins" will change.

   (Comment: See Hawkinshire (Ed.), Parent, Teachers, Youth: A Teenage Weekend Laboratory, for information about attitude change. Requires more concentrated effort than suggested here.)

Group B

Some of group B's reactions to the data were:

1. "Marginals" receive the same benefits from play as "Ins" but don't recognize it.

   (Comment: The data suggests that this is not so. Even though the "Ins" may receive pay, for instance, and the "Marginals" sometimes the satisfaction of making something, let's say, the important thing is what they regard the meaning of work to be for them. The meaning, acquired over a long history of experiences, structures expectations, affects motivation, rewards sought, etc.)

2. Implementations:

   1. Improve the opportunities for success for the "Marginals."

      a. organize clubs on the basis of interest (Pools, Bowling, etc.)

b. reduce qualifications for participation in school and class organizations.

(Comment: Possibly the only qualification would be that students not be on (academic) probation. A Junior/Senior High School recently changed its policy concerning participation in school activities in order to accomplish this aim.)

2. Need for in-service training to acquaint teachers with "Marginals'" needs.

(Comment: Excellent point. Not only acquaint teachers but give them a chance to develop specific skills tailored to the needs of the marginal student.)

Group C

Some thoughts from this group were:

1. Elementary school source of attitude -- Headstart type program would be a way to shape these attitudes.
2. Common college goals -- this too often is the only serious orientation which teachers have towards their students' future.

Group D

Selected ideas from Group D.

1. Restudy relationships between teachers and students.

   (Comment: Many of the marginal child's difficulties reside here in this interaction.)

2. Careful selection and orientation of new staff members.

   (Comment: The problem seems to be one of finding appropriate materials and methods for teacher training rather than selection. There would very few "ready made" teachers who would be effective in working with the many marginal students.)

3. The "community" relationships of the past are dying -- many teachers no longer know families and their problems.

   (Comment: This lack of "connection" to the community makes it harder for teachers to deal with students as people.)

4. Special activities need special, qualified leadership.

(Comment: See C. C. Jung, Social Adjustment Room Program and The Activities Club Program. Perhaps developing a specialized program will provide enough concrete examples of skills to be worked on so that teachers will get away from just talking philosophy. The problems of implementing these ideas are still with us.)

Programs to Meet the Challenges Presented by the Marginal Child

Group "A"

Goal

1. To improve the self-concept of students.

Target

1. Marginal students

Methods

1. Provide an opportunity for marginals to discuss school policy, make observations on how it is being implemented, and report their frustrations.
2. Provide personnel well trained in group work who can accept the marginal student.

   (Comment: See C. C. Jung, Social Adjustment Room Program, for appropriate techniques. It might be relevant to look at "Science Research Associates" materials also.)

3. Provide an incentive for student participation.
4. Remove student from repeated frustration of the system.

   (Comment: It might be equally important for the student to learn to cope with some frustration.)

Personnel and Supplies

1. Provide sufficient personnel in order to work in small groups.
2. Flexible group structure.
3. Leader is organizer and observer.
4. Use of Federal Funds and Local Funds.

Evaluation

1. In-service workshop to educate entire staff and community to remove resistance.
2. Impress on policy-makers the need for such a program.
3. Make parents of marginal students aware of the program.

4. Attempt to develop a healthy attitude of students involved for acceptance of all students.

   (Comment: See C. C. Jung, The Classroom Human Relations Program, for clues to what might be done to accomplish this goal.)

Failures (possible results that would come out of the program's failure)

1. Reinforcement of bad attitudes.

2. Discontinue this technique.

3. Through planning a great deal of failure will be eliminated.

4. Release student from group when he requested a release.

   (Comment: Evaluation of a specific technique (and program) must include an examination of three possible alternatives when it appears to be failing:

   1. Are we doing the wrong thing?

   2. Are we doing too little of the right thing?

   3. Are we doing the right thing but failing to make progress due to events which are unrelated to what we are attempting?

Successes (possible results coming out of a successful program)

1. More realistic goals.

2. Staff acceptance through in-service training.

3. Workshops and intergroup discussion.

   (Comment: Evaluation of our success should follow similar thinking as we have stated for our failures. In addition, we should try to pin point the specific things which are causing our project to succeed. We may be able to increase our success rate if we could increase the input of things that work. On the other hand, we can eliminate the things that don't work, as well as things which may be lowering our success rate.)

Programs to Meet the Challenge Presented by the Marginal Child

Group "B"

Since teacher attitude seems to be a starting point in helping "Marginals" we would propose that a logical starting point would be to develop an in-service training program for teachers. (A Special Methods Workshop):

Goals

1. To make every classroom teacher a "counselor," that is concerned with students as people, not just as numbers.

2. To develop in our teachers an understanding of how "marginals" think and feel.

    (Comment: Hopefully we would want teachers to understand that students act the way they do for many reasons other than they want to be different.)

3. To provide teachers with techniques and methods which will help meet the needs of marginals.

    (Comment: See comments on techniques in the Group A notes.)

4. To effect a change so that the "marginal" student actually becomes an "in" student.

    (Comment: Expanding the school experience for the student so that he becomes "included in" may be a more meaningful ultimate goal in the long run.)

Target

1. Marginal students

Personnel and Supplies

Not discussed

Budget

1. Preschool conference for teachers for three days prior to regular attendance period.

2. Released time -- half day per month during school year.

3. Consultants and resource persons -- sociologist, psychologist, university personnel, curriculum consultants, juvenile authorities (agencies).

4. To keep a "captive" participating group, provide coffee breaks and lunch at school expense.

5. Build a professional library related to this program. (Include research materials in this area).

   (Comment: See our bibliography of materials.)

6. Secretarial services to complete summary of all meetings.

   (Comment: Excellent suggestion. Good feedback helps group to keep moving ahead with its tasks.)

Evaluation

Not discussed

Resistances

1. Sell Board of Education of benefits of such a program.

2. Public must be sold -- they want children in school.

3. Convince teachers of need for program -- they may not want to return prior to school since it interferes with vacation and summer work.

   (Comment: Maybe examining the consequences of not having this type of program might help the resistance problem.)

Failures

1. Teachers might continue to reflect negative attitudes -- define responsibility of teacher in total workshop.

   (Comment: See comments made for Group A on this section.)

Programs to Meet the Challenge Presented by the Marginal Child

Group "C"

Goals

1. Develop a realistic "self-image" (Who am I?)
2. Develop a responsibility toward his role in the social structure. (Why am I here?)
3. Develop an appreciation for his capabilities and the development of goals which are commensurate with his talent.

> (Comment: Are there things "we the staff" need to learn about ourselves and how we behave which are relevant to the way some of these processes take place in others?)

Target (s)

1. Infant
2. Preschool
3. Elementary → Starting points
4. Secondary
5. Young adults

> (Comment: Maybe entry points is a more appropriate word to describe this approach.)

Methods

1. Aid parents in acceptance of responsibility of parenthood. (Pre-natal Ed., 1st year, 2nd year).

   > (Comment: Excellent point. We have found that many parents have no idea of their "role" in the child rearing process.)

2. Preschool training for 3 and 4 year olds. (occupational orientation)
3. Kindergarten - 6th grade program. (occupational aptitudes)
4. Secondary experience. (occupational direction)

Personnel and Supplies

1. Personnel
    - Teachers
    - Technicians (occupational)
    - Resource personnel
    - Counselors
    - Psychologists
    - Diagnosticians
    - VT's (visiting teachers)
2. Supplies

    (not discussed)

Post-Meeting Reaction Summary from 13 participants of Activity II

1. Were any parts of the presentation unclear to you?

1	Yes
12	No

Would you tell us why?

Are there differences in play and work as defined by "ins" and "marginals?" Well organized. Fast moving (late start was only drawback). More discussion though the presentation was especially well done.

2. Was the way the findings were presented clear?

13	Yes
0	No

If not, what were the specific difficulties?

More time.

3. Do you consider the findings presented to be of much significance for educators?

12	Yes
1	No response

Could you explain?

Emphasize the need for more attention to the marginal students. The attitudes of young people is of great concern to educators. In understanding attitudes we're better able to combat dropout problems, poor attitudes, etc. If techniques to implement them were spelled out (I think they are in your publications). Teachers need this information.
a) Broaden the horizons of educators of the job that has to be done.
b) Brings about an awareness that a growing child is an important person, and care should be exercised to develop his physical, emotional and mental growth. An idea long disregarded. Attitudes as a result of the educational process. I think it's the same problem that many of us recognize, but need help in solving. We are all concerned about this area and need as much help as possible in the development of meaningful approaches which will help us understand "marginals" and "ins". We are involved in the education of children and many of these children and young adults are marginals and as was so often cited, we identify their behavior and fail to recognize the whys and what the school can do to change or reverse their behavior. They appear to imply changes in our program from pre-school to 12th grade. We need to be more aware of the feelings of the students.

(These findings are significant even though they may be frustrating if we are not able to resolve them.)

4. What parts of today's total experience were the most helpful to you?

5	The group sessions
1	Group discussion
1	The results of the survey
3	Presentation
2	All
1	No response

Would you tell us why?

1. Relevant to the actual experiences and observations of the office and position of a school counselor. These are similar to the actual reactions and thinking of both groups.
2. Good interchange of ideas and attitudes.
3. The implementation of research findings is an area which has been neglected.
4. Provided good insight with student attitudes.
5. Caused me to think of applications and our program objectives.
6. Because I was able to hear someone else's view on the topic and I think if we would have had longer, we could come up with some positive views and maybe even solutions.
7. As you pointed out, we must start with a diagnosis of the facts and work toward goals which will provide solutions. The exchange of ideas was particularly helpful. It reinforces what we already suspected and tells me I had better get busy and do something about the feelings and attitudes of our young people.
8. The expert leadership in the group to bring us back to the "whys" and away from the "labels."

5. How prepared are you to transmit the information covered today to your school district?

```
x               x              xx
/    x   xxx    / xx  x  x     /              x  /            /            /
Very ready     Ready           Somewhat          A little     Not at all
```

(Need more review and study was an additional comment of one participant.)

6. How ready are you to suggest your system have its faculty become involved in activities similar to today's workshop?

```
x                xxx
/      x    xx   /  xx   xx    x / x             /            /            /
Very ready     Ready           Somewhat          A little     Not at all
```

How much involvement would you suggest?:

4	a faculty meeting presentation (originally with follow-up of a half-day workshop.)
6	a half-day workshop similar to today's
3	a full-day workshop -- or more (after orientation)

Programs to Meet the Challenge Presented by the Marginal Child

Group "D"

Target of a Special Program

1. Marginal Students

> (Comment: See C. C. Jung, The Classroom Human Relations Program, for clues to how the "ins" have to be involved in a "special program.")

Methods

1. Homogeneous groups in the academic areas only.
2. Hetrogeneous groups for other activities.
3. Give work experience which provides fun, recognition, and money.
4. Parent visits important to the education process if they are to play their part in the program.

   > (Comment: Parental attitudes about work and play can defeat the aims of the program. See C. C. Jung, The Visiting Teacher Program.)

5. Provide status activity for marginals and give them help to do the task.
6. Tasks must be clear to the students in order for them to carry them out.
7. A meaningful personal relationship between teacher and student is important in overcoming many of his negative attitudes towards school.

Designing: Ideas to be Considered

1. The interest of the teachers is a most important thing if they are to participate in developing programs, after becoming aware of students' problems.
2. Content of program must be related to the actual life experiences of the child.

Things to avoid

1. I.Q. vacuum.

> (Comment: All the slow students in one room deprive them of seeing possible successful models that they can imitate.)

2. Social vacuum.

   (Comment: The rest of the students must help in the "special programs." See C. C. Jung, The Classroom Human Relations Program and Fox and Schmuck, Inventory of Teaching Innovations Directed toward Improving Classroom Learning Atmospheres.)

3. A poor definition or unclarity as to the nature of the problem to be solved.

4. Being unaware of the social structure and how it will influence the program.

   (Comment: See Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth, and Coleman, Adolescent Society.)

5. No evaluation of the program's effect on participating students.

6. No feedback on the success of the program for teacher and no personal feedback to the students.

Goals

1. Positive attitude toward school.

2. Positive attitudes toward school work.

3. Parental support of project.

4. Other student and teacher support of project.

5. Self-confidence or improved self image of participating students.

What would be an appropriate time to schedule such an activity?

Beginning of school year
P.M.
Curriculum day (1 hour of released time per month - plus 1 hour after school)
Consult the Superintendent
At any time

7. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

1. A workshop such as this serves to stimulate thinking and it reinforces my attitude toward all students. It furnished more insight in working with other staff.
2. Very good.
3. A most worthwhile experience.
4. I would like an opportunity to use you as a sounding board for some of the programs we may be considering in the future. Would you be available?
5. Would appreciate knowing more of this type of research and activity.
6. I am grateful for the invitation to participate and look forward to your summary.
7. I only wish we hadn't been so pressed for time. It was a very stimulating session.
8. More of this material needs to be given to the total staff, K - 12, teachers, principals, etc.
9. More people should participate in the type of program we had today.

No response - 4

Followup Reactions to Activity II
of 7 of 13 participants

1. As you recall the presentation, did it:

    6 Help you
    1 Frustrate you
    0 Made no impression

2. Did you find the presentation meaningful or irrelevant to working out plans for dealing with the sorts of problems discussed?

    6 Meaningful
    1 Irrelevant

3. As you recall the presentation of information, how would you rate it?

    5 Clear
    1 Not clear
    1 Not reported

4. Thinking back to the discussion of implications, were there ideas mentioned which struck you as being important?

    6 Yes
    1 No

    4a. If so, could you list them here?

    The need for more understanding of student abilities and the need for flexibility to meet these needs through curriculum and extra-curricular activities. Need for more student planning. The revelation of the facts that youngsters do have reactions which are significant to them as they relate to work and play. How and when to apply this information to programs at elementary and pre-school levels, newer innovations to reach the marginals. Stimulate avocational interests.

5. Were there any ideas which impressed you as something you would like to try out?

    6 Yes
    1 No

5a. Could you tell us about them?

Broadening qualifications of students for participation in class activities to include marginal youth. Applying tests. Working with elementary students and developing good practical work courses in high school. We took a group of 15 "marginals" (potential drop-outs) and developed a "saleable skill." Attendents in hospitals are needed and with a little help from the nurse and hospitals, students learned the skills. Those who were 16 have employment and did passing work academically. Identification of problem students and concentrated group guidance in dealing with them.

6. Our final task of the day was to develop a program to deal with the problem of the marginal youth in the school system.

Yes	No	
6	1	Was it clear how one goes about developing a good program?
7	0	Was the program of your own workgroup clear to you?
5	2	Was the program of the other workgroups clear to you?

7. How satisfied were you concerning the design of the program your workgroup developed?

Very Satisfied (1)

The teacher became an important factor. To recognize the need for inservice training to develop a better understanding of needs of the "marginal" youth.

Somewhat Satisfied (5)

Could not give it the time needed to work out detail. It provoked thought and the possibility of applying action to the problems discovered. The programs to implement the knowledge will take far more study than we had time to give. Not really enough time to do a thorough job.

Not Satisfied (1)

Need for more than three or four hours or even three or four days to develop any program that would be worthwhile.

8. Were you about to utilize the program of your group or a program developed by one of the other workgroups in any program planning back in your own school system?

3 Yes
3 No
1 Not as yet

8a. Would you give us an example?

Changed the qualifications for class officers to include students with marginal characteristics. Training program for potential dropouts to help them learn the attendant job in hospital; academic performance improved. We ran an experimental group guidance program with fifteen of our "problems;" it was moderately successful.

9. Did any of the other ideas you heard lead you to make any new plans to meet the school difficulties of the marginal child?

4	Yes
3	No

9a. Would you say what they were?

To a degree it influenced our aggressiveness in securing and expanding our work training program. A program approved under Title I that is under way. Reading program (6 weeks) this summer; 183 students from 7th grade enrolled. Enlarging fall plans in elementary and secondary to meet needs of "Marginals". No, lack power.

10. Would you describe your plan or project in terms of the following questions? What did you hope to change? What were your goals? What are your results to date?

CHANGE: Attitude toward work and school. GOALS: Provide an atmosphere which would assist in the development of good work habits. Develop skills which could provide employment possibilities. RESULTS: In my opinion, the work training program is achieving its goals. The results of the change in policy regarding class officer qualifications cannot be determined at this time.

CHANGE: Attitudes of marginals. GOALS: To improve the self-image of marginals. RESULTS: Too early to evaluate.

CHANGE: Teachers' attitudes toward the marginals. Develop an awareness that every child should be taught and develop his security in establishing himself in this world. GOALS: Using pilot programs, evaluating such, and reporting results to the faculty. RESULTS: Pilot study on 10 sure dropouts. Placed in a special reading class. Developed techniques to stimulate interest. Results: Students now achieving well in a regular class. In the attempt to develop saleable skills, project successful.

CHANGE: Improve student's self concept. GOALS: help the marginal student develop a more positive attitude toward school. RESULTS: No measuring device. Only a feeling that there has been a little success.

11. Do you feel a need for further help or information?

6 Yes
0 No
1 No answer

11a. If yes, in what area and how much?

	SOME	A GREAT DEAL
In diagnosing	5	1
In designing	2	4
In implementing	3	3
In evaluating	3	3

12. What types of information would be most helpful to you in preparing you to cope with the marginal child?

1 Raw facts only
2 Raw facts and specific techniques
5 Specific techniques and ideas for program
5 A developed program (facts, their interpretation, techniques and a fully designed plan)

13. What would be the best source of such information for you?

5 Consultants to building administration or to fellow teachers
5 Teachers meetings (professional conferences)
4 Seminars

2 Fellow teachers
2 Conferences for principals
1 Your building administration

1 Books
1 Conferences for superintendents
1 Post-graduate courses

14. Several items were provided you in a work folder. Would you comment concerning the usefulness or lack of same for the folder?

3 No Comment

4 Comment: Most helpful and needed. Very fine. Very good. I liked the total package and it is something I have used in staff meetings.

15. Sometime following the workshop you received materials summarizing the information and discussion. Were these materials of use to you?

4 Yes
2 No
1 No answer

16. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

More meetings of this nature; perhaps continue on two or three meetings rather than a one day affair.

I appreciated the opportunity to participate and would hope I could be included in future seminars and workshops.

The findings created a new area of concern that should be recognized and dealt with in programming an educational advantage for children.

This information must be put in the hands of teachers; possibly through professional journals like MEA, etc.; these are the people that will have to put it to use with aid from administration.

I feel that very little, if anything, can be accomplished on this particular subject in three or four hours.

APPENDIX D

Activity III
Presentation to Representatives from Eight School Systems in Two Evenings
(The Eight-Hour Activity)

Schedule of Activity III

Summary of results from brainstorming concerning implications of findings.

Provisional Programs from Session I

Summary of Post-Meeting Reactions of 20 participants to Session I.

Programs from Session II with staff comments.

Summary of Post-Meeting Reactions of 16 participants to Session II.

Summary of Post-Meeting Reactions of 8 marginal youth to Session II.

Summary of Followup reactions of 10 participants.

Schedule of Activity III

Session I

1. Reception Period
2. Presentation of Problem Diagnosis Model
3. Presentation of findings on the attitudes of In and Marginal youth toward work and play.
4. Brainstorming in small groups concerning implications of the findings for the educational setting.
5. Sharing and evaluation of brainstorming ideas.
6. Break for dinner.
7. Work on program development (in small work groups).
8. Presentation of programs developed for critique.

Session II

1. Resume work on program development.
2. Interview Marginal youth present for inflomation about what they think and feel.
3. Break for dinner.
4. Complete program development.
5. Presentation of programs developed for critique by staff, participants, and Marginal youth.

Activity III Brainstorming

Ideas concerning the Problem of Marginals in the School System

We need to look at unsuccessful programs.

Marginal students find success in play. Why is this difference so? How far back do we go to locate the origins of this problem?

Are there other groups other than just Ins and Marginals?

Can or should Ins and Marginals have the same activities?

What effect will technological advances have on attitudes towards work?

What effect will our own economic status attitudes have on the two groups?

Aren't there real differences between thinkers and workers?

Marginals seem to be concerned with self, whereas Ins have more group concern.

The manner in which marks are given would make a difference. The rapport between teacher and student. The nature of the reward is important.

Are there Marginal White students?

There are needs for school system revision.

Marginals seek immediate reward. Ins seek more long range rewards.

Marginals look for concrete gratification, whereas the Ins look for more abstract rewards.

Non-school experience of the Marginals is important.

Marginals seem to be people oriented, Ins object oriented.

Ins do become competitive.

Activities which offer the same rewards will be seen as different by Ins vs. Marginals.

Program Ideas, Session I

Group A

A. Goals of the Program

1. Change attitudes and skills of marginals (to improve self-concept and reduce drop-outs.) Various suggestions were forthcoming about how this might be accomplished:

    a. Develop a reading skill improvement program
    b. Have Ins work with Marginals
    c. Academic skill improvement (math, etc.)
    d. Change In group attitudes towards marginals (include teachers in this effort).
    e. Provide a contentless discussion class for bringing about attitude change by way of discussion.
    f. Curriculum change for vocational program.
    g. Develop a better understanding of working class culture.
    h. Change teacher's attitudes about high and low status courses.
    i. Develop counselling programs in the elementary schools.
    j. Have experiences which are rewarding to the Marginals.
    k. Evening use of school facilities.
    l. Integrate Marginals and Ins by getting them to work together.

B. Targets: teachers, youth and parents (society).

C. Methods which might be utilized to bring about all of the goals specified above. (This is a summary of what came from the tape and only reflects my ideas about how you might combine all of these various interests.)

1. Develop a new reading program in the school (other subjects could be added as the program gains momentum.)

2. Have Ins act as teaching assistants (correcting themes, type reports, etc.) with the class.

3. Use materials which will take into consideration cultural differences of the students.

4. Provide information for teachers who have same students in their classes on how they are doing in the special class. Hopefully new attitudes will develop about the potential for students to learn.

Group B

A. Goals of Program

Is to improve the self-image of the marginal person. This can be accomplished by:

1. Upgrading self-concepts of person by having a feeling of doing something that is worthwhile.
2. Obtaining a sense of reality about the nature of the task he is facing. Get rid of overly pessimistic or optimistic ideas.
3. Providing a chance to try-out task where it is safe to experiment before making a permanent commitment.

B. Target of the Program

1. Teachers' and staff's thoughts, feelings and actions towards the marginal person need to be changed.
2. The marginal person himself needs to have some of his thoughts, feelings, and behaviors changed.
3. Parents also need to be involved in the program.
4. Peers and other adults will be influential in making a difference to the successful operation of the program.

C. Methods to reach goals

1. Knowledge of the student's problems (clear and precise diagnosis of the problem).
2. Outcome of the program must be stated--prognosis.
3. A chance to try-out tasks that are important in a safe way before having to try them out for keeps.
4. Priority of tasks and skills to be accomplished must be made clear. The important sequence of the learning situation should be discovered and maintained.
5. The "I" and the "We" (responsibility taking) should be pointed up.
6. The emotional life of the student should be taken into consideration.

Post-Meeting Reaction Summary from 20 Participants of Activity III

Session I

1. As you recall the presentation of information, how would you rate the presentation of findings, problem diagnosis model, and the program analysis check list?

Findings Presented	Program Check list	
12	10	Clear
2	1	Not Clear
5	8	Other
1	1	Not ascertained

Comments:

General: Excellent, material presented clearly and concisely. Clear and just enough. Clear and enough--time was not as adequate as it might have been to go further into detail.

Findings Presented: Not as clear and understandable as other. Good. Would have liked more detail.

Program Check List: Need more time to understand concepts. Good Check List, o.k., very good. We never had time to come up with any significant findings on most of the program check list.

2. Do you think the findings which we presented are of much significance for educators? Could you explain?

YES (15)

If nothing else, the findings can be reviewed and used as modifications on changes into each person's school setting. If nothing else, it makes people aware.

The attitudes of marginals reflect some healthy or worthwhile attitudes.

Directs educators to recognition(or awareness of possibility of existence) of problem and to development of systematic approach to its solution.

Some very interesting and practical data was presented. The lecture part was clear and relevant to what takes place within the classroom.

Better picture of marginal student was presented. Methods of attacking problem of marginal youth must be modified.

It seems to me that as educators we need to know about the attitudes of students in order to be more effective in helping student change his attitudes.

The findings are significant and would be interesting to educators. I'm not sure they would change attitudes or methods of teaching because of them.

Definitely. I feel all educators were concerned about "drop-outs" or the marginals. This evening's discussions have been very helpful.

More insight on our present existing problems.

The findings do suggest the value of a flexible curriculum.

Enlightening.

Many are not aware of the problems of these types.

Helpful in understanding kids.

We can use the findings to give children meaningful and successful experience.

Needs to be explored by all administrators.

YES, BUT (2)

Terminology could be somewhat disconserting if one was not a sociology major or whatever!

Can the educators face up to the real goals and issues or is it easier to just work with methods or models of change?

OTHERS (3)

Some. Rather technical and academic for working educators.

Questionable. How practical is the program if implemented in a district.

If further developed and presented could be quite significant and helpful to educators. More elaboration of the study, more concrete report, more information on area study, examination of types of "equipment" or tools used would help.

3. What parts of today's activities were the most helpful to you? Would you tell us why?

Findings (6). Several misconceptions concerning the marginal student were cleared up. Better picture of marginal student was presented. Most went along with my thinking, it could be I'm on the right track. Results of research always helpful. Had the least knowledge of those findings.

General (4). All the activities were helpful; beginning presentations most interesting. Demonstration of other's concern for problem which was of great concern to me. Opportunity to make more clear in my mind the problems and methods of solution. The exchange of ideas. The presentation was very helpful and the small group discussion useful. I enjoyed the total program (too bad we had to have an evening meeting).

Group Meeting (4). Recognizing that students can't be categorized like automobile parts and that school setting should be set up to meet individual needs and differences; regarding their education as a means to helping them get a realistic self-concept of themselves. Topic was definite and singled out a specific area. The actual determination of a problem and the attempt at defining goals, methods and targets; probably the actual concrete experience of defining a problem. It took some great thought and really looking at the goals--which are generally not done in schools; schools maybe do not look at their goals enough.

Other Presentations (4). The presentation at the beginning on diagnosis; the speaker was sincerely interested and presented the information in an enjoyable way. Program check list--I felt a lot was said; however, I needed more time to accept the information. Analysis. The activities prior to trying to establish a program--because material was presented in a clear convincing manner.

Others (2) The final summarization--participation of the total group. The first group discussion--the second became too ambiguous and too involved with semantics.

4. How prepared are you to take back the information covered today to your school district?

0	Very ready
6	Ready
13	Somewhat
1	A little
0	Not at all

5. How ready are you to suggest to your school that the faculty become involved in activities similar to today's workshop?

2	Very ready
6	Ready
10	Somewhat
2	A little
0	Not at all

6. Our final task of the day was to develop a program to deal with the problem of the marginal youth in the school system.

YES	SOMEWHAT	NO	
13	1	6	a. Was it clear, how one goes about developing a good program?
12	1	7	b. Was the program of your own work-group clear to you?
9	3	8	c. Was the program of the other work-group clear to you?

7. Other comments:

It is unfortunate school people cannot work (interact) on real subjects like presented tonight--but can they face the reality of it?

More workshops on the same order, but should break down into smaller groups. Our group could (?not) agree on what we were here to do and how we were to do it.

I feel the advisor to group was much too insistent that his ideas be those of the group. The evening's activities were well-planned and very helpful to me.

Our staff and especially administration have too many other deep seated difficulties, hooked with time element (not enough time to be efficient at what we are now trying to do) that I'm afraid it (workshop for system's faculty) would fail.

I think the groups were led to the conclusions that the social research staff had already concluded--and that they did too much directing.

I am concerned about what is expected of me and/or our group on Thursday.

I find this very interesting and feel happy I was selected to attend.

A difficult topic to handle, but handled well by your staff.

A valuable experience--it makes one aware of problems which hithertofore seemed very far away. One also thinks he could help and be valuable--better "self-worth."

Generally too vague and theoretical--leaders excellent and knowledgeable.

Program Ideas, Session II

Group A

Cooperative Learning Experience

The Problem: To develop a sequential programmed experience of work-study for Marginal Youth.

Goal: To place marginal youth into an open-ended personally satisfying job situation.

1. Diagnosis would be the initial step in which a number of different operations would be carried out:

    a. Obtain as clear a picture of the student as possible. This would include any vocational interests or orientations, personal concerns of the moment and long range objectives.

    b. Orient the student to the program so that he could take an active part in designing the experience.

    c. Obtain the involvement of the student in the actual design of the work study program via brainstorming and by bringing information back to class about his experiences, etc.

    d. Gain the active cooperation and motivation of the student to participate in the program.

    e. Discover any previously unrevealed talents. (Contents: The diagnostic process should be strictly limited to producing information which will prove relevant to the program. The tendency is to collect vast amounts of interesting but useless information in files. The testing procedures and long periods of delay in getting started serve as factors to lessen the interest of the marginal student. The means-ends problem works against this approach.)

    After the program gets started, having former members come back and talk with the new members might be a good way of helping the new student become more involved in the experience. The returning student would have to have help in making an effective presentation to the student.

2. Prognosis as to what reasonable outcomes can be expected from the effort being undertaken and from the potentiality of the student to become engaged and effective in the work study setting.

    a. careful observation of the student's reactions to his job assignment.

    b. the way the student approaches his class work.

    c. any evidence of talent or limitations from diagnostic work up. (Comment: Setting clear objectives helps the student know how he is doing and what he needs help with to obtain certain goals.)

3. Action Steps to be taken to bring about a successful program.

    a. The initial orientation of the student would start with the diagnostic process. This period would be aimed at preparing him for the work and study situation.

    b. Job placement would be made simultaneously rather than after he had been in the program for a period of time. Ease at building the relevance of the study segment could be the gain here.

    c. The classroom would be oriented around providing information and learning experiences which the student would see as useful to his vocational, avocational, or personal needs.

    d. Classroom work would focus on current preparation of the student as well as helping him to acquire skills for job advancement. Enlarging the student's view of the work opportunities open to him would be a major focus.

4. Evaluation of the program by all participants. The active feedback of the students, employers and teachers would be sought.

    a. Former students would prove to be of value in telling about the strengths and weaknesses of the program as they experienced it.

    b. Having employers tell about their expectations will do much to help shape the study experience toward the most appropriate learning tasks.

    c. Involving current students in the evaluation of the program can help them feel that their ideas are being considered in the design of the project.

    d. Refinement of diagnosis, teaching techniques, subject matter, and the variety of job placements should be a direct outcome of this process.
    (Comments: Very active measures such as interviews, questionnaires, and field observations will have to be taken in order to produce valid criticisms. Many students and employers will say that everything is going fine so as to avoid being critical.)

Group B

1. Modular program.

The Problem: The school curriculum and time schedules are so designed that the students have only very limited opportunity to relate to their teachers informally.

Also, a standard curriculum doesn't allow for much variation in work pace and in personal scheduling of time and activities.

Goals: Change the attitudes, ideas, and behavior of youth concerning school. Specifically, help them to view school as a place where they express themselves and grow in terms of responsibility and independence.

The Method: A system of minimum class time with remaining time relatively unstructured but with teachers and facilities available for students to work out and carry out their own study plans.

Comments: It is possible that many teachers may view much of this free time as time for their own preparation and may discourage students from approaching them.

Many youth may fail completely to utilize such opportunities because of lack of such initiative taking skills. Creative use of time is a highly sophisticated matter and marginals are not likely to be so skilled.

Youths may see this as an opportunity to "beat the system" and actually continually leave the premises. The lack of standard time may seem like "permission" to be idle.

The public reaction to such a scheme may serve to sabotage it before it has had a fair trial.

2. Student-Teacher-Parent Meetings.

The Problem: Many of the problems of youth might be traced to a lack of communication and understanding between teachers and youth, teachers and parents, and parents and youth. The more opportunity for mutual sharing of important issues, the clearer would be mutual expectations.

Goals: To clarify for each the problems, feelings, and expectations of youth, teachers, and parents. It is expected that this type of interaction could lead to greater understanding by parents of their children's needs and to programming of more relevant experiences for the youth. The parents could provide greater support for the teachers' efforts in the school setting.

Methods: Small group discussions wherein all participants would be encouraged to share and discuss their ideas and attitudes about school as well as the experiences and problems of youth in general.

Comments: Such discussions would have to be well managed in order for frank discussion to take place and to prevent them from becoming opportunities for assessing blame and mounting the attacks.

The youth would have to be much reassured concerning possible retribution for the expression of critical attitudes. In addition, they would have to be supported and listened to closely or they could get the idea that they were wasting their time.

There would have to be sufficient administrative support for such an activity to ensure that the teachers could make modifications of their curriculum as they saw fit. Should they not be in a position to take advantage of the information obtained, increased feelings of powerlessness and distrust would be generated on the part of the youth and probably their parents.

3. Recreation Program

The Problem: Many youth have had so few experiences in school which result in any fondness for the school system. Since marginal youth especially gain much feeling of belongingness through contact with friends in recreational activities, more such activities should be programmed into the school day (and night). In addition, well-timed recreational experiences can help all youth to return refreshed to their non-recreational responsibilities.

Goals: To aid the marginals (and indeed, all youth) to develop a positive feeling toward school which hopefully would be reflected in improved motivation toward their school work. To provide an opportunity for youth to discharge many of the tensions generated from their other experiences in school.

Methods: Provide facilities for various continuous recreational experiences at all available times in the school setting. These recreational opportunities should be coeducational where possible.
Methods: (1) before coeducational class swimming parties, (2) coke dances immediately after school, (3) dancing facilities and instruction available both before school and at lunch time, (4) game-type activities within the classroom when they can be used instrumentally to illustrate something about the course content.

Comments: The problem of insuring the inclusion of the marginal child in these activities is acute. Clear lines as to who "belongs" to what activities have developed in most schools. Active attention must be given to this issue in open confrontation with all students on the matter rather than hoping that the marginals will wander in. We must presume that active teaching will be required to help get the marginal child involved in many of these activities. Some will not know how to dance, swim, or how to play certain games. Unless help is given at this elementary level, many will not be able to participate very well, even if they are encouraged to join in.

Post-Meeting Reaction Summary from 16 Participants of Activity III

Session II

1. How satisfied were you concerning the design of the program your workgroup developed? Would you say why?

VERY SATISFIED (6)

The practical work with young people was most revealing.

I thought the total workshop was very good. I would like to be invited to more or some of the other teachers at BTS. It was practical, spontaneous and allowed for critical thinking.

It appears to have several workable and practical facets. It should serve students.

I found it most stimulating. It moved right along. So often the workshops are so "windy" speakers, et.al! I feel much more a part of this shop as opposed to a part to.

This program, in my estimation, was well planned. I learned a great deal that I'm sure will help me on my job.

Good insight and much knowledge and increased scope for participants.

SATISFIED (10)

I was hopeful that more unique innovative suggestions would be developed.

Two meetings are not enough to really develop a complete program.

A bit unrealistic. Modular program stands little chance of working with so-called marginal youth.

Not enough time for discussion.

Not sufficient time to adequately develop program.

Dealt with the problem of obtaining better qualified teachers.

Covered general points but nothing specific or concrete was established. At best, many areas were exposed which stimulated thought and conversation.

It seemed like a logical approach to a complex problem.

I think the program (Group B) will work fairly well for marginal youth.

Very general.

NOT SATISFIED (0)

2. Do you think you will be able to utilize the program of your group or the program developed by the other workgroup in any program planning back in your own school system? Would you give us an example.

NO (4)

Expensive

We already are to some extent. They, however, do need improvement and this is our goal at the present time.

Lack of administrative cooperation and/or concern.

OTHER (2)

In part (hopefully). Hopefully, I would like to initiate a working-training program outside of our school. Presently, it is too hot of an item public relations wise for anybody to act on.

I can't say at this time. After going over my notes and evaluating what I have heard, then I may consider a part, or parts of it.

YES (10)

Interviewing pupils.

The recreation idea, the on-the-job training idea and, in part, the testing program.

Perhaps some cooperative school community action could result in useful experiences for students.

We have people like "your eight" I'm sure. Maybe we should listen more attentively next time "troubles" arise. Possibly now we'll know how to listen.

Faculty-student interaction. Survey student opinions.

In a limited degree I can work some of these ideas (B group) into my contacts with students.

More extensive recreation program. Increased attempt for teacher-student understanding.

The workshop was helpful to me in planning future classroom work.

In part: Youth should be dealt with more firmly and fairly; develop a more meaningful program.

3. Will any of the ideas you heard at the workshop lead you to make any new plans to meet the school difficulties of the marginal child in your school? Would you say what they will be?

NO (3)

I'm afraid the programs are not new.

YES (13)

I believe what a student feels and thinks--more consideration on this to better meet the needs of the student.

Informal teacher-student meetings giving the students a chance to voice their opinions. Also to cement or bridge a better understanding between teachers and students.

Involve this type of youngster in more direct planning of his program--as to nature and content of program.

In the way I try to be more aware of their viewpoints and problems.

Be more understanding of their problems.

More student-teacher involvement; practice being more sensitive to what the students are saying or asking.

Perhaps to entice the prospective dropout to make a more practical adjustment.

Spend much more time talking with students--try much harder to see their "side" of it.

I plan to investigate COT and see if it can be used in our program.

More extensive recreation program; more opportunity for teacher-student understanding.

Roundtable discussions with marginal students.

Make teachers more available to students; make classes more meaningful to students; be more sensitive to the feelings of youth.

I'll write later; I'm still formulating my thoughts.

4. Would you describe your plan or project in terms of the following questions? What did you hope to change? What were your goals as you saw them?

CHANGE: I have many boys in my class who need to feel accepted, to know that I value them as persons. GOALS: My goal, as of now, to watch for the marginals and give them help and at least encourage them.

CHANGE: To assist the marginal youth to become more integrated with school program and society. GOALS: Improve marginal youth's self-concept and make school activities more meaningful and realistic.

CHANGE: Attitudes and self-concept. GOALS: To help the student to grow.

CHANGE: The present lockout system against marginal youth. GOALS: To bring marginal youth within the In group.

CHANGE: Attitudes of marginal youth. GOALS: Improve marginal youth's feeling of self-worth.

CHANGE: Teacher attitude toward marginal student and student attitude towar school. GOALS: Improve students' attitude toward school and perhaps his self-image.

CHANGE: Teacher-student relationships and curriculum structure. GOALS: To make school a much happier experience for a marginal youth. Keep him in by keeping him interested.

CHANGE: Teacher student relationship and a more positive school image for students. GOALS: To develop a greater sensitivity toward marginal youth.

CHANGE: The students, teachers, and curriculum. GOALS: To make a more practical and workable program, to build a more attractive program and to encourage a more realistic teacher attitude and approach.

CHANGE: Self-image of marginal. GOALS: Let people know their possibilities to be more successful.

CHANGE: Perhaps not change, but addition or modification. Study the material very carefully and then see if this information is useful in terms of realism and effectiveness, in terms of implementing them in the program. GOALS: Collecting information, analysis of information, possible implementation of information into present program, and make teachers at our school aware and get their opinions.

CHANGE: Attitudes. GOALS: Meeting needs of young people.

CHANGE: Experiences that provide work skills for students in place of some present unmeaningful experiences. GOALS: To get the marginal student to use his potential to better advantage and to become a successful person.

CHANGE: I'm not sure at this time. GOALS: To better meet the needs of the student.

CHANGE: Blank. GOALS: An understanding of the problem--finding out how students feel and what can be done about their problems.

5. Do you feel a need for further help or information?

NO (3)
YES (13)

If yes, in what area and how much?

In Diagnosis	2	1	6	1	1	2	1
	Little(3)		Some(7)		A Great Deal(4)		
In Designing			4	3	1	4	3
	Little(0)		Some(7)		A Great Deal(8)		
In Implementing	1	1	1	2	2	4	3
	Little(2)		Some(3)		A Great Deal(9)		
In Evaluating			5	5	1	1	2
	Little(0)		Some(10)		A Great Deal(4)		

6. Which type of information would be most helpful to you in preparing you to cope with the marginal child?

0	Raw facts only
1	Raw facts and specific techniques
9	Specific techniques and ideas for program
5	A developed program (facts, their interpretation, techniques, and a fully developed plan.)
1	Don't know

7. As a result of having the boys here tonight, which of the following would you endorse?

9	They provided some good ideas
7	It was a good idea
5	Helped clarify my ideas about marginal youth
4	I see better procedures for obtaining information from marginal youth
2	Helped me to clarify my problems of collecting information from marginal youth

8. Are there other comments you would like to make?

The whole workshop was a valuable experience.

I am glad to have been invited to participate in this workshop.

I enjoyed the workshop very much and want to thank you for including me.

This is one workshop I really enjoyed. I feel I have learned a great deal and hope also that I have contributed to it in some way.

Hope to receive written summary and evaluation of this project.

The workshop deserves further study, more time, and indeed, a great depth of examination and planning. Perhaps the direct production and implementation of a program change to have a model for study would be the most practical way of examination.

In regard to the second part of Tuesday's session, I felt that the group was too large to develop sound goals, methods and procedure. The size of the group made for a rather unyielding learning setting.

I feel that near the end of our interview (in the large setting) tonight we began leaving the realm of real honest answers and entered the realm of the captive audience--entertain them, they seem to enjoy talking with us. For example, one boy's answers to some questions were not even on the same planet with the answers he gave to our smaller group when asked similar questions.

I feel sorry for some of the "marginal youth" who must face daily some of the educators in attendance at these sessions. It is hoped that they (the educators) will now take a more reasonable approach.

I have a better understanding of the attitudes these boys have toward the total school--teacher, curriculum, supervisors, etc. Ideas they have given me will be more helpful in dealing with marginal youth in my own school.

I felt this was a helpful but exhausting experience. Four and one-half hours after a full day at my school building was maybe more than I bargained for. I felt that the law of diminishing returns set in after about three hours and the last hour and a half was not too productive.

The programs that were developed were not new. Many such events have been taking place. I feel we need many new types of programs. We need new orientation at all levels of education. Tradition and mores still dictate to our own schools much outdated procedure. In order to meet the needs of our drastically changing society we need to drastically change our schools.

I sound negative for myself. However, if this has brought others some new innovative ideas it has been worthwhile. Because things weren't new to me doesn't mean that they weren't new to others. I hope you have been successful in changing some of the attitudes of the people present at the workshop.

I believe that one assumption of the workshop, at least as it appeared, was that the participants had neither experience or knowledge in program development. In this regard enirely too much time was spent in dealing with elementary techniques known by some of the more experienced participants. I believe the program could have been much more effective had it dealt more specifically with the developing more fully the marginal youth, who he is, and why.

Post Meeting Reactions of the Marginal Youth Attending Session II

1. What teachers should know.

There should be a program set up in such a way that it would give the individual a chance to express himself and some of his problems.

You should treat everybody equal and not be prejudiced.

I would like to let them know how I feel about them and the school that I was attending.

I think teachers should never "down" a person in or about something he can't do so well, because it really makes him or her feel that there is no need in learning.

2. What do you think of what happened?

As I have trouble in English, I think this happening tonight might inspire me.

Well, I feel that this whole thing we had tonight was most interesting and absorbing. And about that going to school or class for an hour and being out, for a free hour is the best plan I have ever heard in trying to help a school plan. I felt it should really be put in effect very soon.

I think what happened tonight was very good. If some one could make up such a school that we talked about, I think a lot more kids would go to school and there wouldn't be so many dropouts.

I think that it did everybody some good and there was a lot to think about.

I believe that this program will probably have a good result. If it were to have meeting such as the one we experimented with.

3. What happened that you liked the least? The best?

I didn't like the question and answer period before the individual interviews. I liked the interviews the best. (While waiting for the participants to use them the boys were in a "warm up session." Questions were asked about their opinions on school.)

The least thing that I liked was when we went to watch the movie, (the boys watched a movie during the first period after the meal break). The best thing I liked was when we were talking. If it was possible I would like to do this again.

I liked the whole discussion, and there was nothing that I disliked.

It gives a student a chance to express himself and some of his problems so that the teacher can understand him better.

4. Did the teachers (participants) really want to hear what you said?

I believe the teachers should have let the students know that they are concerned.

Yes, because they are interested in all the students and their education.

The way the teachers acted, seemed that they were very satisfied. They seemed that they were interested in everything that we said and did. If teachers could only get together with students like we did tonight all kids would speak their peace (sic) of mind and talk about problems that they have.

If they didn't want to know about how to improve their schools I don't think they would be here.

And from one, a letter:

Dear Sir:

I enjoyed being here with you all very much today. I think it was a very interesting subjects we were discussing about. I felt the teacher's really wanted to know how we felt about this subject. I just feel that if they didn't want to know what we thought, then they wouldn't have come here. Also if they didn't want anything to do or say to us they wouldn't be teachers. I think everything went along just fine. They had a lot of good points to discuss with us tonight. All I've got to say is I enjoyed being here very much and would love to come again. It was great!

Thank you kindly,

Summary of Followup Reactions to Activity III from 10 of 20 Participants

1. Do you think the findings which were presented are of much significance for educators?

   10 YES
   0 NO

   Could you explain?

   Revelation of research and ideas that can be implemented.

   Very practical items were focused on; however there wasn't much new material.

   Yes, with the qualification that the findings be presented in a manner easily digestable by any classroom teacher. Many of us do not have sufficient background to apply many of the findings in a classroom situation.

   Findings are of importance to people (teachers, counselors) who deal with marginal youth.

   It brings to light information on attitudes and behavioral characteristics of students who tend to make up the group that consists of dropouts and delinquents.

   Most educators in the daily business of classroom instruction and building administration need the type of research and reporting you did. Future presentations from you would be appreciated.

   If these findings were known to more teachers perhaps more understanding would develop for students. Consequently better programs to serve them might be initiated.

   Probably--review of curriculum to bring about more flexibility.

   Yes, because I find myself more aware of the marginal student.

2. The first activity after the presentation was a brief discussion of the implications. Were there ideas mentioned then which struck you as being important?

   7 YES
   3 NO

If so, could you list some here?

The brief brainstorming session helped me to feel at home with the group of teachers we were to work with during the planning period.

The view one takes of himself; position of group and those in group; view of school--purpose and relatedness of philosophy.

The implication was that something of a positive nature should be done to aid and assist marginal youth.

I've observed and been involved in their implementation and have found them valuable and effective.

It was mentioned that many delinquent boys begin to show acting-out behavior at about the third grade level--so this is a time when teachers should be alert to maladjustment and make appropriate referrals.

The idea of a more homogeneous group of people to cite the needs of, and facilitate the curriculum for, the more "needy" students. The problem of motivating poorly directed students seemed to be paramount in importance to most on my committee.

3. Where there any ideas which impressed you as something you would like to try out?

7 YES
2 NO
1 No response

Could you tell us about them?

Student involvement in planning curriculum alterations and changes. It was interesting to hear some of the other panel members cite situations where they had become involved in such student-faculty-administrative planning sessions.

The modular approach was discussed as being a good innovation. However, it would not be the kind of structure to offer at the Boy's Training School.

Co-op program. T-groups. However, these kinds of programs were not new to me.

Modular scheduling and flexible scheduling.

I'm very interested in a program such as modular scheduling that would give students more opportunities to develop responsible behavior. Unscheduled time would do this.

I would like to see a work-school cooperative with training on the job while actually receiving pay and also classroom training.

I've been trying to help certain marginal boys accept their own home and family. These boys came from "good" homes, but they feel that they must get out on their own.

4. Our final task was to develop a program to deal with the problem of the marginal youth in the school system.

YES	NO	NO ANSWER	
4	5	1	Was it clear how one goes about developing an effective program?
6	4	0	Was the program of your own workgroup clear to you?
4	6	0	Were the programs of the other workgroup clear to you?

5. How satisfied were you with the program of your workgroup?

VERY SATISFIED (1)

I felt that many day-to-day problems which I face were also faced by the rest of my committee. I became aware of many problems which otherwise I might not have recognized.

NOT SATISFIED (1)

The ideas were not very creative.

SOMEWHAT SATISFIED (8)

We seemed to try to accomplish too much in too short a time.

I think we had something developing in theory. More time and review would have helped.

Again, we had some of what I felt were good ideas, goals, theories, etc. We did not however have any organized way of developing these.

My workgroup showed considerable interest and inclination to favor programs for marginal youth. Adjustment of programs to meet need of marginal youth examined.

Not too satisfied--there was nothing offered that was of real interest to the problems which we face at the Boys' Training School.

I had already experienced these programs and was looking for new ones.

6. Have you been able to utilize any aspects of the program of your group or the programs developed by the other workgroup in any program planning you are doing back in your own school system?

4 YES
6 NO

Would you give us an example?

Not as of the present time--will keep trying.

Next year we are planning some extensive revision in that aspect of our curriculum which deals with the vocational part of our school. We are planning on working on a program with a local school district.

Students in my school are of elementary level age and the programs were for older students.

Somewhat. We have discussed the possibility of having a fourteen period day next year. Many of the ideas presented in our program have been helpful in explaining why I think this modular-type scheduling has possibilities, especially for marginals.

Our team has in counseling and advising used information gained at the workshop.

It was discussed somewhat in detail the need of a good testing program and also students were brought in to make their own evaluation. We are working on making our testing program more effective; it's now in the neophyte stage.

My work is with elementary pupils who differ considerably from situations and youth as encountered in the workshop.

7. Did any of the ideas you heard at the workshop lead you to make any new plans to meet the school difficulties of the marginal child?

6 YES
4 NO

Would you describe your plan or project in terms of the following questions? What did you hope to change? What are your methods? What are your results to date?

CHANGE: We hope to work out a shared time program with the local public high school since we do not have the money or the plant to work out a program of our own (a Catholic High School).
METHODS: Discussion groups among faculty members and students who might be involved in this program.
RESULTS: Ongoing.

CHANGE: Help certain marginal youth accept their own home and family.
METHODS: Conferences with the student.
RESULTS: Not too good.

CHANGE: Design the program to more adequately fit students.
METHODS: Work-study approach. Training on the job.
RESULTS: Not yet implemented.

I feel I better understand the marginal-type youth and can recognize him more readily. In counseling with them this has helped establish better rapport.

CHANGE: I would like for my instructional staff to assume more responsibility in planning and developing the curriculum for marginal children.
METHODS: Reporting to staff meeting the recommendations.
RESULTS: None.

CHANGE: A better testing program would give us more information in regard to more effective programming. By programming more effectively we could guarantee a higher degree of success in affecting a student's self-image so as to result in better behavior.
METHODS: Not determined.
RESULTS: No results.

CHANGE: Attitudes of staff toward marginal youth and their motivation.
METHODS: Presentation of new found facts.
RESULTS: Difficult to determine.

8. Do you feel a need for futher help or information?

9 YES
1 NO

If yes, in what area and how much?

	LITTLE	SOME	A GREAT DEAL	NO INDICATION
In Diagnosis	1	3	4	1
In Designing		3	6	
In Implementing		2	6	1
In Evaluating		3	5	1

9. Which type of information would be most helpful to you in preparing to cope with the marginal child? (There were some multiple responses).

0 Raw facts only
2 Raw facts and specific techniques
7 Specific techniques and ideas for program
3 A developed program (facts, their interpretation, techniques and a fully designed plan)

10. What would be the best source of such information for you?

8	Seminars
5	Fellow teachers
4	Consultants to administration or to fellow teachers
4	Teachers meetings (professional conferences)
4	Post-graduate courses
3	Professional journals
3	Books
2	Conferences for principals
0	Your building administration
0	The superintendent's office (specialists)
0	Conferences for superintendents

11. Did you think it was a good idea having the boys present as resources?

10	YES
0	NO

Would you explain?

It was most instructive. However, it was equally helpful to have the people who know the boys well. Less time had to be spent on wading through what was relevant and what was unrealistic.

Listening to an experienced counselor interview a young man was helpful. His manner of putting the boy at ease and obtaining information was good.

They gave insight not available from outside sources. Very interesting attitudes and opinions. Good exchange.

Gave us an idea of the actual feelings these children experience. I felt they were quite honest and sincere with us.

The boys gave a great deal to the session. I learned much from them.

The boys were frank and honest. They told it like it was.

They are honest and can contribute to the educator's understanding of attitudes.

Helpful to some members of the group.

The first hand information from the boys was extremely informative. Was able to better understand the problems confronting the boys and how it contributed to their predicament.

12. How prepared do you now feel to pass on the information covered in the workshop to your school district?

    0 Very ready
    3 Ready
    4 Somewhat ready
    3 A little ready
    0 Not at all

13. How ready are you now to suggest to your school that the faculty become involved in activities similar to this workshop?

    1 Very ready
    2 Ready
    4 Somewhat
    3 A little
    0 Not at all

14. What part or parts of the workshops' activities were the most helpful to you? Would you tell us why?

    Our group discussion, however, too much time was spent on being polite and professional. It took two such sessions to really say what we thought.

    The planning period. I liked the way the group tried to come with a really workable plan.

    Last part and interview with boys of marginal characteristics. Probably most "down to earth"--more interesting.

    Having the boys talk with us. Because they were the students who are considered marginal. The people speak much louder than simply statistics.

    The discussion in an informal setting with other educators. The experiences that they were involved in at their school districts.

    The diagnostic presentation. The presented material was in a very realistic, clear, and practical manner.

    Description of characteristics of two types of youth. Broadened my understanding.

    Presentation of factual material.

    Meeting with the boys. It was working with a realistic situation and removed from the theoretical.

    Beginning session.

15. What did you like the least about the workshop? Would you tell us why?

Some of the people selected. Many had one opinion and did not bend with the current.

Long session. Perhaps three shorter sessions would have been better.

Too many hours after a day's work. Would be better during an afternoon.

At the first meeting, I was quite dissatisfied with the discussion groups.

The long periods without breaks. The overload of information in too little time to reflect and absorb.

The group setting, the initial one. We could not get together too much.

The time it was offered. I was tired.

Lack of creative programs.

The short time devoted to the workshop. The topic is so complex that considerable additional time would be required to really make a satisfactory study.

16. What did you like the most about the workshop? Would you tell us why?

Again, many of the committee were interested, interesting people and gave freely of their knowledge and experience.

I liked the way the group tried to come up with a really workable plan.

The interviews and reports from the marginal boys. Probably because they were interesting subjects.

Discussing some of these problems with the boys.

The precise organization of what you wanted and the minimum waste of time in directing us to what you wanted.

The interview with the marginal students. It brought realism into the seminar.

The presentations by two outstanding group leaders. I was impressed.

Research.

The opportunity of coming into contact with educators with varied backgrounds and experiences.

The sincere interest on the part of program organizers to assist the group in understanding the problem of dealing with the marginal youth.